

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

II.

FEBRUARY, 1931.

VOL. XX.

IN MEMORIAM

ROBERT HENRY CHARLES.

By the death of Archdeacon R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A., on 30th January, the Church of England has lost one of her foremost scholars, although happily not the fruit of his labours, which is a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί*.

Born in the country of Johannes Scotus Erigena, he began his brilliant academic career at Queen's College, Belfast, and passed thence to Trinity College, Dublin. Ordained deacon in 1883, he served his first curacy in Whitechapel. Weak health compelled him to give up strenuous parochial life in 1889, but it did not prevent him thereafter from devoting himself to the less strenuous life of the scholar-teacher.

With a foresight as judicious as that of Max Müller, he elected at the very outset of his career the subject of his life's research. That subject was Jewish and Christian eschatology—the doctrine of the last things—Death, Hades, Resurrection, Judgment, Hell, Heaven. His reason for this selection was not, as Max Müller's selection of Sanskrit, purely academic ambition: it was primarily the promotion of moral and religious health.

Christian doctrine in Dr. Charles' youth was disfigured by much repulsive and even immoral eschatological teaching which defied the Divine Being, antagonized the nobler instincts of human nature, and cast a horrid 'Tophet-glare' on man's life and destiny. Christian teachers, like F. D. Maurice and his

disciples, had been bitterly attacked in ecclesiastical circles—Catholic and Evangelical—for their efforts to reform this teaching. Their arguments in criticism of it were almost entirely moral and spiritual: they denounced it as blasphemous, as demoralizing, as grotesque, as incredible, as fundamentally un-Christian. R. H. Charles adopted another line of attack. He resolved to investigate the sources of this eschatology. His motto might have been: 'I do not denounce, I explain.'

This undertaking involved, if it were to be done thoroughly and thoroughly he resolved to do it, immense labour. The sources to be investigated were mainly preserved in the Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature, and demanded for their thorough critical investigation a vast amount of original research and no little linguistic knowledge, for this literature had been preserved in the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Slavonic tongues. Very little was known of the original documents by British scholars, and Charles had to collect, collate, translate, analyse, interpret, and edit his texts before he could present his history of the origin and development of eschatological doctrine. It proved to be a task of forty years. His first text, *The Book of Enoch*, translated from the Ethiopic, appeared in 1893. As the years went by there followed *The Book of Jubilees*, *The Secrets of Enoch*, *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, *The Assumption of Moses*, *the Ascension of Isaiah*, *The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, *The Apocalypse of St John*, and a number of lesser texts. The series concluded in 1929 with his *Critical Commentary on Daniel*. In 1913 there appeared a noble edition, in two great volumes, of the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, edited by Charles with the co-operation of other scholars.

The general conclusions derived from this work of research were set forth in two volumes. (1) *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity*. This volume consists of lectures delivered on the Jowett Foundation in 1898, published in 1899. The second edition, revised and enlarged was published in 1913. It is the standard work on this subject. (2) *Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments*. This was published in the Home University Library in July, 1914. It is a wonderful piece of

ular exposition by a great scholar, and is worth its weight in gold. To appreciate it fully the ordinary reader should peruse it in conjunction with Dr. Edwyn Bevan's delightful volume, *Jerusalem under the High Priests*. Charles in his volume deals mainly with the literature and ideas, Bevan with the history of the period.

The main task of Charles' life was now concluded, and we owe much to him for its accomplishment. He made plain what had formerly not been realized, the fundamental distinctions between Prophecy and Apocalypse. He exhibited clearly the conditions which produced apocalypse and determined its development, and he unveiled and separated the true and permanent elements in it from the false and futile. Thus by means of literary and historical criticism he relieved Christian eschatology of its terrible burden of grotesque horrors, and at the same time brought out clearly the real value of the contribution made to the Jewish and Christian faith by the apocalyptic mystics and seers.

Though this undertaking entailed much painstaking toil, it must not be supposed that it depressed the toiler. He was so absorbed in his work as hardly to feel fatigue. His research was with him, about his path and about his bed: like the loyal servant of the Deuteronomic Law, he meditated on it when he lay down and when he rose up, and as he walked by the way. That was the secret of his successful perseverance. In the preface to his *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, he wrote:

'The labour involved has been very great, at times indeed oppressive, but it has not been without its compensations; for the toil has been frequently lightened by the joys of discovery, and the task of research has been often one of sheer delight. The pleasures of fox-hunting are not to be compared with those of the student in full quest of some truth, some new fact showing itself for the first time within his intellectual horizon.'

In that confession the spirit of the Irishman and of the sportsman as well as of the true scholar is disclosed.

But while he carried on the work of the scholar, he did not neglect that of the preacher. He could not fail to make his sermons educative; he was most careful that they should be so, and in addition they enshrined a note of inspiration and moral spiritual fervour. He was a zealot for righteousness and

spiritual religion as well as for intellectual truth. A number of volumes of his pulpit discourses are published. The two which most truly represent this spirit are *The Adventure into the Unknown* (1923) and *The Resurrection Life* (1919). *Gambling and Betting* (1925), *Divorce and Nullity* (1927), *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce* (1923), were vigorous deliverances on behalf of morality. His Warburton Lectures on *The Decalogue* exhibit his ability in treating Biblical critical problems in sermons. He possessed that 'blessed clearness' which the pupils of 'the judicious' Hooker so much valued in the teacher.

Archdeacon Charles was an eager and unflinching promoter of the Modernist cause. His advocacy was marked by a precious combination of sanity and courage. He began life as an Evangelical Protestant, but early chose the ascending road to which an unfettered love of truth directed him.

His Modernism is visible enough in many of his writings, but the clearest and most compact exposition of it is to be found in Chapter VI of *Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments*. The chapter is headed, 'Reinterpretation and Comprehension.' There one sees clearly how his Modernism grew naturally out of his studies. The Rabbis had a saying, 'N clod-hopper is a sin-fearer,' and certainly no thoughtless person will be a Modernist in his religion: he will be either an obscure antist or an agnostic. The chapter opens with the statement:

'One of the strongest impressions experienced by the reader who studies in their historical order the Canonical and non-Canonical Books of the Old Testament is the consciousness of the continuous, and in many instances the progressive, reinterpretation of traditional beliefs and symbols. This holds true alike of the most sacred and fundamental conceptions of Judaism as of its less essential elements.' . . . As we study it we see . . . 'every conception . . . undergoing development or reinterpretation. Whole histories centre round such conceptions as soul, spirit, Sheol, Paradise, the Messianic Kingdom, the Messiah, Resurrection. Where the spiritual life was active no religious conception could remain unaltered. If it belonged characteristically to an earlier period of development, it had either to be discarded or transformed. If it was capable of growth, it grew: otherwise it proved a stumbling block to the faithful and an obstacle to spiritual progress.'

He shows how the earlier and lower stages of Israel's faith had to be interpreted at a later stage in conformity with the new and higher theology. He adds:

'It is not possible to see how otherwise continuous spiritual progress could have been maintained in Judaism. And what is true of Judaism is true of all Churches. No Church which makes this right of interpretation impossible can continue to be a spiritual leader of mankind. Spiritual and intellectual growth without it is impossible, and so far as the leaders of a Church succeed in making such growth impossible, so far they succeed in limiting its membership to the mere traditionalist and the obscurantist, in short, to the intellectual and moral minors of the race. This right of reinterpretation was exercised by every prophet, seer, and great teacher from the Exile onwards: it was naturally exercised in an unparalleled degree by our Lord in dealing with the Law, and in a very drastic fashion by S. Paul, and in some measure by every writer of the New Testament.'

He next points out that the early Church of the New Testament excluded from her membership those guilty of serious moral offences—'those who sinned against the divine life in the individual and in the Church.' Those, however, who were in doubt or intellectual error in regard to Christian doctrine were excluded. He writes:

'Thus St. Paul did not exclude from the Christian Church those who denied the Resurrection, but treated them as persons to be reasoned with and instructed.'

The later Church changed all this. Hence:

'Christianity came to be identified not firstly and chiefly with a spiritual life in Christ, but firstly and chiefly with the acceptance of certain intellectual beliefs about Christ, that were maintained alike to be infallible and unalterable.'

The result of this policy, he declares, has been such

'That many of the prophets could only work outside the official Church, and among them may be reckoned not merely actual Christian teachers, but also great students of science, whose discoveries in search of truth have revolutionized our modern theology.'

The Archdeacon's conclusion is clear and forcible, and our English Church authorities are slowly but surely advancing towards its acceptance.

'The Church, which declares its formularies to be incapable of reinterpretation and which maintains them to be unalterable, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, cannot hope ultimately to escape the same end that befell that great empire.'

In the second half of the chapter, he deals with the comprehensive character of a national 'established Church.' He points out that as a consequence the Jewish Established Church

'Attained a degree of comprehensiveness that the entire Christian Church, Anglican and Protestant, Greek and Roman combined, cannot rival. . . . Thus Sadducee and Pharisee, Herodian and Essene worshipped in the Temple, bound together not by uniformity of intellectual

belief, but by unity of spirit in the worship of the same God . . . Within that ancient Church intellectual and spiritual growth were possible in a degree unexampled in subsequent times, or in any Church. Such a Church was well fitted to be the Mother of Christianity.'

And then this loyal and devoted son of the Church of England beholds a vision of his own Church emulating this fruitful comprehensiveness

'Now with the history of such a great Church in the past before us, are we not encouraged to look forward to the time when the National Church of England will in one respect—namely, its comprehensiveness—resemble the Jewish Church of that period, and become the spiritual mother of all spiritually-minded Englishmen—all who worship God as revealed by Christ and His disciples. Spiritual unity, not intellectual conformity, would be the essential mark of such a Church.

'Such a hope cannot be simply set aside as visionary and ideal, for a Church still more comprehensive did exist—an established Church, and on the roll of its members the Founder of Christianity and all His apostles without exception. Judaism, then, was a comprehensive Church, but *it was only comprehensive so long as it was established*.* When it ceased to be an established Church . . . the liberty of interpretation in a spiritual and progressive sense was suppressed . . . and so became in its essentials a mere sect. This history of the past is instructive. The severance of Church and State was disastrous to Judaism, and what was true then is no less true now. I cannot here set forth how necessary in a Christian nation, Church and State are to each other, and how in reality they represent only two sides of one and the same Christian Society.

'To the thoughtful students of the past and of the present it is not disestablishment, but re-establishment of national Churches that is now necessary, if the Church and State of the various Christian nations would each achieve their highest.'

We have ventured to cite his Modernist convictions with some fulness. They may not be popular in ecclesiastical circles to-day. That is a secondary consideration. The real question is whether they are sound. We could wish of course that they were attractive to traditionalists and obscurantists and sectarians, but even if all his fellow-Churchmen had been opposed to them their exponent would not have surrendered them whilst he believed them to be true, nor would he have despaired of their final triumph. On his first meeting with the writer of this notice nearly thirty years ago, he said in unforgettable words :

'To be only one, but to be with God, is to be in the majority.'

The quality of his scholarship won for him a European reputation. Learned bodies recognized his abilities. Professor of Bib-

*Italics are mine.—H.D.A.M.

al Greek in Trinity College, Dublin, he became a Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. He was elected a Fellow of the British Academy, and appointed by the Crown to a Canon's stall in Westminster Abbey. His colleagues there elected him Archdeacon of Westminster. He did not seek these honours. Although he had poor health and suffered at times from excessive mental strain, yet his life was full of happiness: it was ennobled by heroic ideals: it was enriched by many friendships and wide interests: it was brightened by a sense of humour. What his life gained by his marriage to one who entered into all his interests, intellectual, social, and spiritual, may not be written. Assuredly he was one of those of whom Matthew Arnold wrote:

‘Radiant with ardour divine:
Languor is not in your heart,
Weakness is not in your word.

* * *

Ye fill up the gaps in our line,
Stablish, continue our march,
On, to the bound of the waste,
On, to the City of God.’

H.D.A.M.

DISESTABLISHMENT

A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE BISHOP
OF DURHAM AND CANON J. M. WILSON.

THE correspondence quoted in your last number, that appeared in *The Times* of December, between the Bishop of Durham and myself was cut short, and the Bishop wrote most courteously to me to explain why. But in doing so he repeated or summed up his arguments for Disestablishment in terms which provoked an unwilling reply from me. It cost me nearly a week's labour. He again wrote, in more than courteous terms, on December 24, though, as he said, he did not reply to my letter but supported his argument by an appeal to Evolution. This challenged me to a fresh reply, which took me till Jan. 9, nearly a fortnight; and at the close of it I felt obliged to withdraw from further correspondence. My reason is obvious: I am plainly enough disqualified by age and infirmities; but I think that this correspondence is worth publishing.

There is much more that I should like to say, but I will only add two final remarks.

One is that the fact must be fully recognized by our Church that dogma is not the only, and not the principal, sphere of the Christian religion.¹ That needs expansion, but it must come from some other pen than mine.

The other is that the Church Assembly, in its interpretation of the valuable Enabling Act, has undoubtedly made a mistake. It has been led to think that—to quote the words of the Bishop of Durham²—‘Parliament was reasonably enough supposed to have definitely surrendered certain privileges.’ But the State has done nothing of the kind; happily, as many of us—indeed, I believe most of us—now think.

It is not an irremediable disaster, if it is a disaster at all. But it is very hard for the Assembly to confess a mistake and undo it. It is scarcely in human nature to do so. But may we not look for something above human nature in an action solemnly taken by a Church of Christ?

JAMES M. WILSON.

February, 1931.

Auckland Castle,

Bishop Auckland.

December 12th, 1930.

MY DEAR DR. WILSON,

I take the impression from your letter in *The Times* of this morning that I caused you to think that by my short ‘*pace* Dr. Wilson’ I was lacking either in a just appreciation of what you had written, or in personal courtesy, or even in both.

You must give me leave then to assure you that I was *solely* influenced by the fact, which seemed to me apparent, that neither the Editor nor the Public desired to discuss the subject.

The definition of the Church is not easy: but no tolerable definition could *me judice* so identify it with the modern State as to allow acquiescence in the supreme control, even in such matters as the Form of the Communion Service, which now belongs to the British Parliament.

¹ I see that Dean Inge has just said nearly the same in his Preface to his latest work, ‘that he has been convinced that the centre of gravity in theology was moving from authority to religious experience.’

² On p. 33 of his pamphlet on *Church and State in England* (S.P.C.K.).

I am working at a short article on *The Church and the Modern State*, and the more I reflect on the subject, the more evident does it appear to me that the two can no longer rightly or wisely be so closely associated as the existing Establishment implies. We are moving towards great trouble (of which the tragedy in Russia is the rough preliminary), and I would rather that the Church faced the future with as much freedom as possible.

With great regard,

I am,

Ever sincerely yours,

(Signed) HERBERT DUNELM.

Steep,

Petersfield.

December 19th, 1930.

MY DEAR BISHOP OF DURHAM,

I assure you that it never crossed my mind that you had in the slightest degree failed in courtesy to me. But I do feel that you appear not to give due weight to the facts I mention. I also was very brief, because *The Times*, as I knew, had little room to spare. I will try again.

You imply that I suggest such an identification of the Church with the Modern State as to allow acquiescence in the supreme control by the State of such matters even as the Communion Service, and that the control even now belongs to the British Parliament.

The Church of England and the State have each a very large sphere of action in which the other has nothing to do. That precludes the use of the word *identification*. And even if we limit the word to identification when they are dealing with the same subject, its use is equally incorrect. Their spheres even here are entirely different. Church and State agreed long ago to a form of Public Service which can only be constitutionally changed on the initiative of the Church, but the State has the right of refusing to consent. The British Parliament could not alter, add to, or suppress a syllable in our Prayer Book. That relation is surely incorrectly described as '*complete control*.'

Constitutionally the recent action of the House of Commons was perfectly correct. They exercised a power which the Church unfortunately forgot, or did not realise from the beginning.

They have done us no wrong; they have not threatened us; they have only scared us.

There is a further point to which I refrained from calling public attention. The resolution of the Church Assembly on Nov. 17, 1930, has also a shaky foundation on which you build. It is, by beginning its preamble with a 'Whereas,' avowedly based on the high authority of Archbishop Davidson. In words addressed to the Assembly on July 2, 1928, he said, with the concurrence of the whole body of Diocesan Bishops, that 'It is a fundamental principle that the Church . . . must . . . retain the inalienable right . . . to formulate its faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. . . .' This is a general statement, which no one disputes. But the Resolution that follows assumes, without defence or explanation, that it is applicable, as it stands, to the Church of England, a mere fraction of the whole. Your letter also, in *The Times* of Dec. 8, apparently quotes these 'fundamental principles' as binding on the 'English Churchmen.' What is true of the whole is not necessarily true of the part.

On such untrustworthy foundations as these you still build your case for Disestablishment. But make, I beg you, a table of Gains and Losses which England and the world would experience through our Disestablishment. You would gain freedom from control, and you would be governed by Churchmen alone, by experts or ecclesiastically-minded persons. I ask, is that safe? History gives us an answer in the College of Cardinals. Can any government be worse? The Roman Church in the fourth century inherited the Roman Empire as its sphere. There was then living active Christianity in every province round the Mediterranean; and the Church had a free hand. What now survives of the Churches that met at Nicaea and Chalcedon?

What would our fate in England be under Disestablishment? I leave it to you to draw a picture. But be sure that Parliament would be merciless in disendowing a Church that was coquetting with Rome, or anything like it. Do you realise that a large portion of the majority vote in the House of Commons was given on definitely religious grounds? There is a vast number of Christian men and women in England, including many Churchmen, who disliked and distrusted part of the Revised Prayer Book. They saw in it an advance towards

an intellectual and metaphysical conception of Christianity which was utterly foreign to them, and for ever out of the reach of the poor, who still, as in Christ's days, form, and will always form, the great majority of the people for whom a Church is intended.

Or again : what is the ultimate aim of a Church in a country? to convert the people. But the conversion of every individual of a nation must be considered impossible. Does not then a time arise when the nation is so far convinced that it may be permitted to have some share in the government of the Church? Is not that educationally wise? Is not the difference between Arabia and Turkey, as seen in *Loyalties, Mesopotamia* (ch. ix), or my son, and England, as seen, for example, in *God in the Plums* (Hodder and Stoughton), sufficiently great to justify giving our people such a share? I wish you would read both books. I think you would come to see as I do that England is a Christian country, at bottom and throughout, still : and that as one *representative* body, Parliament, must be treated as Christian.

There is a strong silent movement, in England and elsewhere, towards a Reunion of Christians, the Church of Rome alone excepted. It still slams its door in the face of all other Christians, and bolts and bars it. Let us aim at a worthier Christianity. Let us not slam our doors against Christians without very good cause.

I have been critical so far. I must try also to be a little constructive. But I write now with difficulty in every sense : I must beg you to overlook a very inadequate expression of my meaning.

Our Church, the Anglican Communion, like the Church of Rome, has in the past largely misjudged both its aim and its methods. This can scarcely be disputed if we look at its present position. I need not attempt to give reasons. I blame nobody. But some transformation is necessary.

As a result of that misjudgment, even the Lausanne Conference of 1927 reckoned only Faith and Order as the elements of Christianity in which to look for Reunion. And they did so with general approval. But surely that is to overlook the far greater power of the example of Christ. That is the real and

permanent magnet of attraction : that touches men's hearts ; that creates the quiet enthusiasm of missionaries ; that, and that alone, has created the wonderful Salvation Army and trains all its officers ; and that also, along with patriotism, supports the hospitals and the innumerable undenominational charities of England to relieve distress. Is it not wonderful that the name of Christ should be uniquely respected by thousands who to all appearances have barely heard of Him ? People will unite to do all this for Christ, not for Faith and Order. Ponder this fact ; ponder it long. Thank God for it, and again I say, Thank God.

If some great man, or some group of great men, were to appear in our Church as proposers of a Conference to consider a transformation of our aims and methods, the making of Christlikeness once more what it was at first, the supreme object of the Church, and all else subordinate, what might not be the result ? To invite cordially the Free Churches to join with us in the worship of Christ with the primary object of producing *Christlikeness* ; with no uniformity but a large variety of forms of worship, all under the sanction of the United Church of England ; with a common standard of *Beliefs* and Creeds, rendered now possible by our acceptance of the recent Lambeth Report on the Christian Doctrine of God as the common background for the interpretation of the Creeds and the ancient expression of the Church's beliefs, to be everywhere and constantly retained and recited in church, as the ages pass, as our title deeds to the Apostolic Faith : and *Order*, guarding scrupulously, meticulously against the possibility of any hostile insinuation of a breach of succession in the ministry of the United Church from that of the Apostles ; with extreme care for the ultimate reunion of the whole Church, if God so wills. The Non-Episcopal Churches will surely respond to an appeal, after our assurances in the Lambeth Conference of 1920, to waive their strong personal claim, and come all the way to meet us, for the sake of such a vast step towards ultimate reunion in a world-Church, remote though it may seem to-day.

That is the nature of my dream to-day.

*Believe me, with great respect and hope,
Ever yours sincerely,*

JAMES M. WILSON.

Auckland Castle,

Bishop Auckland.

December 24th 1930.

MY DEAR DR. WILSON,

I have to thank you most heartily for your kind and valuable letter. Of course you are perfectly free to publish my letters to you, if you think it well to do so. I think that it is important to remember that a right of veto may become in practice something far more serious. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries assumed the possibility, nay the rightfulness, of *stereotyping* doctrine and forms of worship : and the veto of the State on the innovating action of the Church did not, *on that assumption*, necessarily involve any wound to conscience or reason : but now that we think in terms of evolution, when the Church was making a serious effort to bring its formularies into accord with its actual convictions, *the veto of the State meant that it was compelled to maintain in use much (e.g. the question to the candidates in the Ordination of the Diaconate : the compulsory use of the Quicunque Vult : the Baptismal Office) which conflicted with conscience and reason.* In fact, a living Church cannot rightly, in my view, restrict its freedom of doctrinal and liturgical revision within the limits permitted by the public opinion of a nation which has (so far as the overwhelming majority of the citizens are concerned) ceased to interest itself in either doctrine or liturgy : nor can it without loss of self-respect allow its forms of faith and worship to be determined even indirectly by non-Christians like Mr. Saklatvala and others who voted against the Revised Prayer Book. I agree that the recent action of the House of Commons was 'perfectly correct' in point of law and (though here I am not quite so sure) even constitutionally ; but that circumstance only shows that *the Establishment itself has become indefensible.* I admit freely that Disestablishment will involve heavy sacrifices, though I cannot agree with those who think that the State would refuse to the Church of England that completeness of self-government as a disestablished Church which it gave to the Church in Ireland, in Wales, and in India. But when (as I conceive to be the case here) the issue is one of fundamental principle, I cannot allow that any argument based on material

considerations is properly relevant. Let me turn from a matter in which, to my great regret, I have the misfortune not to command your approval. I would desire permission to wish you in the coming year, which starts in such deep clouds of anxiety, the Blessing of Peace and the continued homage of your many friends and disciples, among whom I hope you will allow me to include myself.

Most sincerely yours,

HERBERT DUNELM.

P.S.—This letter is no answer to your careful and thought-provoking discussion of the larger issues. You may be assured that I shall weigh your words most carefully.

Steep,

Petersfield.

January 9th 1931.

MY DEAR BISHOP OF DURHAM,

Your letter of the 24th December has equally surprised and gratified me. I did not suppose that you knew anything of me. I have no claim of learning or position that qualifies me to correspond with you, and to get such attention as you have given me. I have only had some fifteen, or perhaps twenty, more years of life, in which I have thought much, and I may say prayed much for light, on the extraordinary complications and perversions in the history of Christianity.

My sole aim has been to convince you that it is not only a mistake, but also wrong, to press for Disestablishment at present. But now, owing to age and defective sight, I can scarcely read anything, and I am further failing in power and memory and expression and thought. I do not intend, therefore, to trouble you further than with this letter, nor do I expect an answer to it. I must say very briefly what I have to say in addition to my last letter, and then leave it to you to do what may seem right. In your letter of the 24th December you have shown the real point at issue between us, and I can scarcely avoid commenting on it.

You say 'we *now* think in terms of evolution.' I agree. But there are many evolutions going on simultaneously. There is the immense mysterious evolution of the universe and of Man, too great for us to understand. And there is the evolution of

Christianity: the explanation of the *mysterium Christi*, the progressive realization of the purpose of Jesus Christ. That may never be long absent from the mind of a thoughtful Christian. And within both of these great historical evolutions there are innumerable minor evolutionary processes going on, in saying which we must remember that evolutions are not always in the true direction, but sometimes in the reverse. And in all cases the minor rapid evolutions of which we are conscious are tested by the greater evolutions which take centuries, even millennia, to work out. These great slow evolutions, of which the actors in them are unconscious, are the field for the philosophic Christian historian to discern and explain. It is only these evolutions that our faith in God requires us to believe must be divine in origin. I have written this brief digression in order to remind you that when you say 'we now think in terms of evolution' we have entered on an extremely difficult and intricate field of discussion.

You write confidently of 'the Church' (you mean, of course, the Church of England) 'making now a serious effort,' and of being thwarted by the State. Consider how small are as yet the signs of permanence and dominance of this incipient evolution. It is in great measure limited to the clergy of our Church and to a small following of a somewhat clerically-minded laity. I have not the actual figures accessible (you will correct me if I say wrong), but I believe that the voters in England for the laity in the Church Assembly are between three and four millions, and that of these not more than between sixty and seventy thousand registered their votes on the last occasion, that is, not more than one in fifty.³ There are very many reasons for

³ The following are the figures obtainable from *Whitaker and The Church of England Year-Book*:

Population of England (1921)	...	...	35,389,993
Number of Parliamentary Electors	...	...	23,485,974
Voters in General Election (1929)	...	...	18,565,883
Qualified Church Electors on Parochial Electoral Rolls (1929)	...	...	3,627,104

The total of the votes cast for the Church Assembly members is not given, and it would be very difficult to compute it. The Parochial Church Meeting elects representatives to the Ruri-Decanal Conference; and the R.D.C. elects to the Diocesan Conference; and the Diocesan Conference elects to the Assembly. In a large number of cases, it is not unfair to say that the laymen in the Assembly sit there as the nominees of the clergy.—*Ed., M.C.*

this trifling proportion, quite other than 'indifference to doctrine or liturgy.' But on the strength of this pitifully small number of supporters you are advocating the irreparable step of Disestablishment, which will deprive millions of men of the spiritual privileges conferred on them by a parish church (which many value highly, even though they rarely use them) and of the ancient witnesses to the Christian Faith of the whole nation. These spiritual losses far outweigh the 'material considerations' to which you refer. The co-ordination and co-operation of Church and State in promoting practical Christianity in a nation appear to me invaluable.

But turn, I beg, from this small evolution, of which the sole motive force has recently arisen in a section of devout and earnest (but occasionally thoughtless) clergy, with insignificant support of the laity, in a small portion of the great movement in religion that sprang two thousand years ago from the Life and Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ; and contemplate the far greater, far longer, far wider evolution (alas, still miserably incomplete), to be studied in history, of Christ's desire and purpose for mankind. It is only in such light that we ought to consider our small movements.

Can we bear to think quietly of what the world has made of Christ's coming, during the last two thousand years, and what we are even now trying to make of it?

Let us picture Him, looking at the world of to-day with a comprehensive gaze and insight. To what part of His professed followers can He look as carrying out with intelligence, however imperfectly, His will for men. I look round the world with this thought in my mind; and the only great country in which I see that His principle of love and brotherly care for one another has begun to take root, both as an approved principle of legislation, tested for a thousand years, and as a universally accepted axiom for right personal conduct—not to do to others what we would not wish others to do to us—is our own happy country.

Look at what our country stands for now in the eyes of the world. It stands not only for the great interests of justice to the poor, and the young, which I have already alluded to; but look at its care for slaves and all who suffer, for prisoners of war

for others, for factory children, for the deficient, for the fallen, for the crushed, for all appeals to humanity, in the treatment of animals in vivisection and slaughter. Individuals among us, coming from business interests, have at times forgotten humanity; but the nation, on the whole, has shown itself to be definitely on the side of justice and protection of the weak and suffering. Are not these truly Christian, truly spiritual, functions? Is the opinion of such a State, when deliberately and legally expressed, to be disregarded, treated as merely secular, unspiritual, irrelevant, even intolerable? Our nation is not as it once was, relatively uneducated. Think of our many universities: think of the multitude of our good secondary schools.

These two evolutions, the great and the small, the permanent and the passing, are working now in opposite directions. You cannot take part in both. You must take your choice. The great evolution, at its beginning in this country thirteen hundred years ago, gave authority, sole authority, to the teachers, of necessity, as their teachers. They have in the past centuries done their work so well as to make this nation, under God's providence, what it is, thoroughly, though half unconsciously and quite unostentatiously, Christian in character and practice. And by the Constitution, the Houses of Parliament have attained a co-ordinate share even in spiritual matters of preventing hasty changes. One of the Houses has unexpectedly exercised this power; and this exercise has surprised the clergy, and they, not fully understanding it, are resenting it. They are claiming, and appeal to history and some reason for support of the claim, an exclusive right to determine matters of doctrine and worship, based on usage and their admittedly true succession by Episcopal Ordination from the time of the Apostles and so from Christ Himself, and deny any form of spiritual authority to the laity.

The greater evolution appeals also to history and reason; maintaining, what is also admitted, that there is no trace in the New Testament of Christ's intention that such a power should be permanently entrusted to any class of men; and the fact that, while the claim has grown naturally from that of teachers who asked only for simple deference, to that of possessors of permanent authority over the taught, the exercise of that unchecked

authority has manifestly led, and is leading, to the present condition of the Church, in which there is a predominant interest in points of doctrine and liturgy, passing into metaphysics, to the comparative neglect of pressing the obvious duties of justice, brotherliness and humanity among the less instructed masses of our people.

The great evolution points to welcoming the co-ordinate spiritual authority of a nation which has slowly grown out of heathenism to a truly Christian conception of justice, brotherliness and humanity. The small evolution refuses even this modicum of spiritual authority to the State, and takes refuge in saying that the nation has only the Houses of Parliament to represent it, and while men like Saklatvala can sit in Parliament it is impossible for them to regard the Parliament as spiritual. That ignores the fact that the Members of Parliament vote for constituencies solely as representatives, not as individuals, and that fifty Saklatvalas would not affect the evolution while the Constitution stands as it is.⁴

I plead for time : time for England to realize the advantage to Christianity of union with our Nonconformist friends, which the minor evolution would soon make impossible ; time for the Church of England to weigh the recent Lambeth Report on the Christian Doctrine of God, which seems already to be being shelved ; time for us all to think more deeply of the will of God.

I thank you sincerely for your courtesy in this correspondence : I think I shall feel bound to publish it somewhere next month, as it is concerning such vital interests. And now I retire from this unequal duel.

Yours with great regard,

JAMES M. WILSON.

⁴ We have heard from both an Anglo-Catholic source and from an Evangelical source that before voting in the House of Commons on the Deposited Book, Mr. Saklatvala made a point of consulting the clergy of his constituency and found only one of them a supporter of the Deposited Book. It was this which largely influenced him to vote against its legislation. He strove to vote as the representative of the Church feeling of his constituency. Surely no Bishop should blame him for this, unless Mr. Saklatvala voted against his own conscience, which is ' the candle of the Lord ' within him. But there is no evidence whatsoever that he did vote against his conscience. In this case Mr. Saklatvala's vote may be claimed to be a Christian vote.—Ed., M.C.

THE PROSPECTS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH *

by the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., author of *Studies in Modernism*, etc.

THE prospects of the Roman Catholic Church have been variously estimated. George Eliot told the late Lord Ford, when a young man, that he would live to see a notable revival of religion among thoughtful people. What Church would profit by it? he asked. The answer was, 'The Church of Rome.' On the other hand, in a well-known passage in *The Pilgrim's Progress* the author of that famous book describes :

'A cave where two giants, Pope and Pagan, dwelt in old time by whose power and tyranny the men whose bones, blood and ashes lay there were cruelly put to death. But by this place Christian went without much danger, whereat I somewhat wondered. But I have learned since that Pagan has been dead many a day; and, as for the other, he is by reason of age and also of the many shrewd brushes that he met with in his younger days grown so crazy and stiff in his joints that he can now do little more than sit in his cave's mouth, grinning at pilgrims as they go by, and biting his nails because he cannot come at them.'

These words are remarkable when we consider the time at which Bunyan wrote. For under Charles II Giant Pope was a real danger to our civil and religious liberties. The terror inspired by Oates' Plot which, fictitious as it was, was probably not wholly an invention as it has been thought, shows the state of public opinion; and it was not till the Revolution of 1688 that the fear of Rome, which for more than a hundred years had haunted the imagination of Englishmen, had become a memory.

In our own time there seems to be a certain recrudescence of this fear; there are those who seem to believe that a notable advance of Roman Catholicism is taking place in this country. That there have been a certain number of secessions is true. There may be more; the recent Prayer Book Revision measure, and the mischievous agitation in favour of Disestablishment which followed its rejection by Parliament, have given rise to a feeling of unsettlement which is peculiarly fatal to that 'quietness and confidence' in which the strength of religion lies. The two most prominent recent seceders are a well-known preacher, Mr. Vernon—and preachers are not so common amongst us that

* This article was sent to us by our valued contributor shortly before his death. We believe that it was the last article written by him.—ED. M.C.

we can afford to regard his loss with equanimity—and a graceful and accomplished novelist, Miss Sheila Kaye Smith, whose studies of English country life are familiar to many of us. But two swallows do not make a summer. I think that Bunyan was right and George Eliot mistaken. Our alarm is groundless. In one case which came under my own notice it resolved itself into the secession of two elderly single ladies; and a rumour with regard to a recently ordained curate which proved to be untrue.

And we have to consider the significance as well as the number of the secessions. Their number is small; their significance is less. When at the time of the Tractarian Exodus in the forties, an alarmed Protestant told Lord Palmerston that six peers had gone over to Rome during the last few weeks (which was probably not the case) his answer was that, if he had heard that six greengrocers had done so he should have shared his informant's alarm. Palmerston knew his England.

' Lord So-and-So, his coat bedropt with wax,
All Peter's chains about his waist, his back
Brave with the needlework of Noodledom,
Believes! Again, who wonders and who cares? '

Bishop Blougram's Apology is probably the best psychological statement of the Roman Catholic case. But it was written in 1855, and is of another age. I shall not argue that Giant Pope is less crazy or less stiff in his joints than he was either in Bunyan's or in Browning's time. But if he be so, it is for other reasons and in another sense. Read Mr. G. M. Thomson's *Rediscovery of Scotland*, and you will see that the densely populated mining districts of Clydesdale are being flooded by Irish illiterate immigrants among whom Communist propaganda wins easy recruits. A similar danger threatens the United States, where, in spite of the recent restriction of alien immigration, Irish, Italians, Slavs, and Levantines increase and multiply. The question is whether the Roman Catholic clergy will be able to retain their hold on these imperfectly assimilated invaders. If they can, Romanism; if they cannot (which is the more probable alternative), Communism will be the predominant creed of large and populous mining, urban, and manufacturing districts both in Scotland and in the United States. I do not think that in either country Catholicism would have the ghost of a chance among persons of education. The low culture of the

Roman Catholic population is the Nemesis both of Scottish and American democracy. Here are our Barbarians; here is the finger-centre of the modern world.

Those who follow the Roman Catholic propaganda in this country, a propaganda whose psychological interest is considerable, will have noticed that it has entered of late on a new stage. A generation ago it centred in such questions as Orders, Jurisdiction, and the Sacraments. Timid Anglicans shivered at the suggestion that their clergy were unordained laymen; that they had therefore never received a valid communion; or that they were, as likely as not, unbaptized. Such 'traps for the ignorant,' as Fr. Tyrrell used to call them, have gone out of fashion; the reason of this is that they have ceased to tell. The wonder is that they should ever have been effective. We consider those tricks of exegesis and ecclesiastical legerdemain,' and we are as cold as contempt can make us; we remember the mental torture inflicted by them on simple people, and indignation takes the place of contempt. The Church of Rome has not receded, and indeed cannot recede, from positions which she has once taken. But such questions are no longer prominent. The practical instinct of the Papacy addresses itself not to antiquarians, but to the Cave of Adullam found on the outskirts of the modern world, in which the malcontents of modernity—'everyone that is in distress, or in debt, or discontented'—gather, and gibe effectually at the tide of life as it rolls by. They are sometimes men of literary gifts: seldom, if ever, of scientific or philosophical attainments; they feel rather than reason: they never think; they always know. Truth means little to them: certainty much: they do not ask 'Why?' Ultramontanism attracts, a scientific religion (in the German sense of the word scientific) repels them. And the temperamental affinities of our Cavemen, whom Mr. Shaw happily describes as 'the Chester-Bellocs,' are rather Mediterranean than Nordic; they are intolerant of the formless and unsystematic; impatient of that haze on the horizon which Nature is never without, either in thought or landscape. Compare Pope with Blake, or Watteau with Turner; or, to pass from the province of art to that of science, read one of the most amusing books of the post-war generation, Mr. H. G. Wells' criticism of Mr. Belloc, *Mr. Belloc Objects*.

The main cause, however, of the increased propaganda of the Church of Rome in England is not propaganda, but migration, the dispersal of the Irish race over the English-speaking world. Secessions, in particular the notable secessions consequent on the Oxford Movement have, no doubt, been a factor in the result. But they have been a minor and subsidiary factor, and have ceased to count. Baron von Hügel calls attention to the falling off both in number and quality of the converts since 1870, the year of the Vatican Council; and 'especially (he says) during the last decade,' *i.e.* (as he was writing in 1913) of the period covered by the Pontificate of the anti-Modernist Pope Pius X. But the importance of the conversions 'so numerous and so remarkable between 1845 (the year of Newman's secession) and 1870' (which witnessed the Definition of Papal Infallibility) has been exaggerated. The Tractarianism which produced them lay outside the European, and even the English, mind movement. Its founder was a man of genius; yet, great as was his significance for a section of the Anglicanism of his generation, the trained intellect of the time passed him by. To the representatives of English speculation and science, to the historians, the men of letters and the poets of the Victorian Age, who were his contemporaries, he was no more than a name. It would be difficult to mention one of the seceders whose outlook was that of his period, or who could be quoted as an authority on any scientific subject. Their attainments were partial, and their interests narrow; the world in which they figured was a clerical and academic, a small and superficial world. Mark Pattison, the most typical scholar of his generation, describes it:

'Newman assumed and adorned the narrow basis on which Laud had stood two hundred years before. All the grand development of human reason from Aristotle down to Hegel was a sealed book to him.'

To his successors it was sealed with seven seals; yet

'There lay a unity, or unity of thought, which far transcended the mere mechanical association of the unthinking members of the Catholic Church; a great spiritual unity by the side of which all sects and denominations shrink into vanity.'

The attraction of the past is a permanent fact in history; it 'will always win

A glory from its being far
And out into the perfect star
We saw not when we moved therein.'

This is especially the case in religion : from the Reformation onwards there has been an appreciable stream of secession to come from the Reformed Churches ; a perceptible reaction towards mediaeval religious conceptions and towards the Church of which they have been retained. This Church exercises over the lesser Churches much the same attraction which Judaism exercised over the early Christian communities. And for similar reasons. The larger body draws the smaller into its orbit. It is more imposing and more venerable. Macaulay speaks of it as 'that august and fascinating superstition,' it is more in what Matthew Arnold calls 'the grand style.' To what extent such considerations affect us is mainly a matter of temperament ; it is rather temperament than either reason or conscience which in the great majority of cases accounts for secession, or leads people to take up habits of thought or modes of worship which look that way. If Rome stands to us for the poetry and England for the prose of religion, it is useless to argue ; as Paley says of Gibbon, 'Who can refute a sneer ?'

What underlies this state of mind is a sort of hypnosis, or auto-suggestion, which leads us to confuse what the Papal Church claims to be with what it is. Modern Ultramontaniam and mediaeval Christianity are two different things. With all its faults, many and great as they are, Mediaeval Christianity was an embodiment of the thought and life of its time. So rich and full was this life that it found room for incongruous and incompatible elements which, when the Reformation shattered the framework which held them together, dispersed and went their several ways. The centrifugal are to be found in the Reformed Churches ; the centripetal, mainly for political, though in part no doubt also psychological, reasons fell back upon the Papacy. Each of the two families developed on different lines, following its own character and interior logic in such a manner that, as time went on, differences were accentuated and points of contact lost. In the Roman Church of to-day culture, formula, and authority have arrested the life movement. It is a Latin, not a European, a world power ; the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire has been followed by the Decline and Fall of the Roman Church. The Christian Fatherland is wider ; Stanley's fine paraphrases of Arndt's poem strikes its true note :

' My native land is wheresoe'er
 Christ's Spirit breathes a holier air ;
 Where Christlike Faith is keen to seek
 What Truth and Conscience freely speak ;
 Where Christlike love delights to span
 The rents that sever man from man :
 Where round God's throne his just ones stand,
 There, Christian, is thy Fatherland '

During, and immediately after the War, people tried to persuade themselves that a revival of religion had taken, or was likely to take, place. In England we had the National Mission, the promise of which was perhaps greater than its performance; in France what was known as the *Union Sacrée* placed patriotism above party, and the fine qualities shown by the clergy and by the religious of both sexes won universal admiration. But it does not seem that any movement of opinion was the result. That the zeal of those who were already practising Catholics was stimulated is probable; such writers as Peguy, Maritain, and the representatives of the *Action Française* caught the ear of a section—a small section—of the literary public. But neither the mind nor the life of the nation was touched. Indifference is the note of the French attitude to religion; the Modernist controversy and the abolition of the Concordat in 1896 interested foreigners more than Frenchmen. I hope, I greatly hope that I am wrong, but I am not sure that it is not part of a general tendency of opinion and feeling, or that things are not moving in the same direction and on similar lines here. I confess that Mr. Shane Leslie's suggestive books, *The Cantab* and *The Anglo-Catholic*, give one this idea. Mr. McCabe's *Decay of the Church of Rome* was published in 1909; and nothing that has taken place between then and now affects its main thesis, that 'instead of showing signs of increase the Church of Rome is rapidly decaying, and only a dramatic change of its whole character can save it.' Such a change would be a miracle: and miracles (in this sense of the word) 'do not happen.' For the question of numbers, serious as it is, is secondary. The cultural value of the figures must be estimated. They show that 'fully 80 per cent. of the actual supporters of the Vatican belong to the illiterate masses of the population; and that, in proportion as education is given to them, they tend to discard their allegiance to Rome'

The ideal of the Church of to-day is a peasant democracy, segregated from European culture, and administered by priests. It is unlikely that it will be realized; things are not moving on these lines.

The recent Lateran Treaty has, at least for a time, solved what since 1870 has been known as the Roman question. The treaty has been commented on by the well-known French journalist who writes under the pseudonym of Pertinax in his *Partage de Rome*; and the official documents which bear upon it were published in a special number of *Europe*. On the face of it, the treaty and the Concordat between Italy and the Holy See which accompanied it were dramatic events. Under Pius IX or even Leo XIII no one would have thought them possible; but time, with the leadership of a strong Pope and an autocratic minister, has brought it about. The concessions, however, made to the Pope are somewhat nominal. The size of the territory in which his sovereignty is recognized is small, scarcely as large as St. James' Park: but, great is the power of words: within it Pius XI is once more the Sovereign Pontiff. Catholicism becomes the religion of the State, which it was in fact before; but freedom of worship is guaranteed to other religions; the Pope receives certain satisfactions of form and phrase; but he may find himself less his own master than he was formerly, for he becomes, officially as well as in fact, the protégé of Italy; the Vatican City is a protected State. Its ruler has freedom of movement; he can go to his cathedral, St. John Lateran, to Castel Gandolfo, to Monte Cassino; had he chosen he could have done so from the first; his so-called imprisonment was self-imposed. Already the acrimonious reproaches addressed both by the Pope to the Duce and by the Duce to the Pope are evidence of 'the little rift (nor is it as little a rift as it may seem) within the lute,' which by and by may well 'make the music mute.' Megalomania is contagious. The Duce would revive a World-Empire; the Pope a World-Church. Dreams of a sick mind! 'Thou hast set them their bounds which they shall not pass, nor turn again to cover the earth.'

The high-handed policy of Pius XI in the matter of the *Action Française* is of ill-omen to the Church of which France is still the elder daughter: it was a maxim with Leo XIII, who

was in the line of the greater Pontiffs, that 'nothing (he emphasized the word *nothing*) should make him break with France.' The recent deliberately provocative action in the case of the two Maltese bishops is an instance of the same temper. 'See how this man seeketh a quarrel against me!' and, where temper is in, wit is out.

The historian may wonder how the Vatican has acquired, or retained a reputation for statesmanship. It is a reputation which has survived the fact. In the pettifogging tricks of diplomacy it has generally been able to command the services of useful agents; but its whole management of the Latin races has shown neither tact nor vision. Pelion has been piled on Ossa; blunder on blunder. The history of the Roman Commonwealth is reproduced with singular fidelity in that of the Roman Church. In each we see a body of men, strong rather than either spiritually minded or intelligent, indifferent to ideas, bent on material ends, prudent, tenacious, masterful, rising first to prominence, then to domination, and founding a Universal State. In each religion was employed as the instrument of policy. Its sanctions were not wanting to the Empire; the Church masked secular designs under the disguise of piety; her aims, her weapons, were material. Her wisdom was that of this world. Here, as there, decline followed close upon maturity. Some germ of disease, it seemed, entered into the system. The governing body lost the qualities of an oligarchy, its tenacity became stubbornness; its indifference to ideas unintelligence; its caution fraud or craft. And the world changed. New forces came into play; new elements made their appearance; success called for other qualities, intelligence, quickness, adaptability, than those which had been demanded in the past. The centre of gravity shifted from the Empire to the Nations, and from the Church to the Churches. In each case the older body lingered, *informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum*; in that of the Church it lingers still. But it lingers as a survival of a past world in a new order. Slowly detrition works upon it, slowly disintegration advances and cohesion decreases. It may disappear in the short agony of revolution; it may perish, more probably, in the long process of secular decay. In either case its destiny is the same.

Fuimus Troes; fuit Ilium et ingens
Gloria Teucrorum.

It is probable that the inevitable loosening of its dogmatic principle among Latin Christians will be brought about less by criticism, for which they have in general neither aptitude, equipment, nor inclination, than by the relaxation of the political and governmental tendencies of the Church under the pressure of a new mental climate, and by the conception of the Church as spirit taking the place of that of the Church as law. Meanwhile, the Papacy remains the most complete and consistent expression of the mediaeval outlook over life, but over life fossilized. Hence its unfailing attraction for the mediaeval mind which survives, and on a larger scale than we think, among us. For it is possible to live in a time without being of it; the modern mind is exceptional even in the modern age. To how many the conceptions which the mental life of to-day is based—evidence, sequence, causality—are foreign and unintelligible! The scientific foundation is wanting; they live fragmentarily and as it were piecemeal, in a disconnected world. This accounts for the strange reveries of type, the fantastic religious and moral aberrations, differing little in form and less in substance from those of the later Empire, which crop up from time to time among us; still more for the reaction (passing indeed, but for the time being noticeable) in favour of an institution so closely bound up with the past, so intimately associated with religion, founded on so wise an observation of human nature, as the Roman Catholic Church.

It is not without significance that her title deeds should rest on a doubtful tradition, the Episcopate of St. Peter in Rome; on an uncertain relic, the deposition of his remains in the Vatican Basilica; and on words that were in all probability not spoken by Christ. So among men truth and falsehood are mingled; so the colours of good and evil are mixed.

‘Creeds pass; rites change; no altar stands whole.’ But the connection of religion with external things, however close, is accidental; they pass; it remains. The Papacy is a fragment of a past world surviving in a later age. This is its refutation. For life is a stream; and in religion, as elsewhere, a return to

the past is impossible; the past is a stage in a process which has been left behind.

And now from the conceptions of life and men and God which took shape in the Middle Ages mankind is moving ever further away. Yet there is no idea, or set of ideas, which has greatly moved humanity which, for all its admixture of base metal, has not left a residuum of gold. 'Even when the advance of reflection has shown us the necessity of modifying beliefs which were formerly held without question, we do not (says Renan), we never shall break with the symbol under which we first discerned the ideal. Because faith, for us, consists not in the formal assent of the understanding to obscure metaphysical propositions, but in 'the affirmations of the heart.'

THE VISION OF MAX MÜLLER

By the Reverend Canon H. J. PALMER.

'THE Church Universal' has been brought into prominence by the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference in regard to the South India Church scheme of reunion: but without explanation or definition as to what exactly we are to understand by it. The reorganized Church in South India is to be not Anglican or Roman, but a Province of the 'Church Universal.'

Can it mean that the Bishops of Lambeth had before them the ideal of a Church, yet to be, whose boundaries were too wide to define, whose doctrines were too comprehensive for an Catholic Creed to include—a Church Universal, as wide as the world and as comprehensive as the Love of God, which would include all who, of whatever Nationality or Faith, seek for truth and desire union with God?

The ideal of a Church Universal has ever been before the eyes of the Prophets, ancient and modern, who have looked over the ecclesiastical and credal barriers to the time when 'the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea,' when all men shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest of them. F. D. Maurice, Bishop Lightfoot, and Dean Stanley, stand out conspicuously amongst our English seers, but

of peculiar interest to refer on this occasion to the writings of Prof. Max Müller, the great Oriental scholar of undiminished age, and especially to his Address in Westminster Abbey, to perhaps the earliest and clearest ideal outline, from the missionary point of view, of the gathering Church Universal.

It is not inappropriate at a time when India is so much interested by the discussions at the Round Table Conference to consider how much we owe to India, rather than the more popular subject of what India owes to us. Prof. Max Müller pays an eloquent tribute—more forcible to-day than when it was first uttered—in an Address to a Congress of Orientalists half a century ago :

‘The East, formerly a land of dreams, of fables, and fairies, has become to us a land of unmistakeable reality; the curtain between the West and the East has been lifted, and our old forgotten home stands before us again in bright colours and definite outlines; two worlds, separated for thousands of years, have been reunited as by a magic spell, and we feel rich in a past that may well be the pride of our noble Aryan family. We say no longer vaguely and poetically *Ex oriente Lux*, but we know that all the most vital elements of our knowledge and civilization—our languages, our alphabets, our figures, our weights and measures, our art, our religion, our traditions, our very nursery stories, come to us from the East; and we must confess that but for the rays of Eastern light, whether Aryan, or Semitic, that called forth the hidden germs of the dark and dreary West, Europe, now the very light of the world, might have remained for ever a barren and forgotten promontory of the primeval Asiatic Continent. We live indeed in a new world; the barrier between the West and the East that seemed insurmountable, has vanished. The East is ours, we are its heirs, and claim our share in its inheritance.’

The South India Church Scheme may be the foundation upon which the Church Universal is to be laid: it may be in the East and not in the West that the prophetic ideal is to be realized, that the Religions of the East are to absorb and unite the contending Churches of the West in a fuller and more comprehensive Faith.

This seems to have been the view of Max Müller, when on the invitation of Dean Stanley, in face of great ecclesiastical opposition and obstruction, he delivered a memorable Address on Missions in Westminster Abbey in 1873, upon which so much modernist teaching has been based. He points out that it is the missionary character, peculiar to the three great religions, Buddhism, Mohammedanism and Christianity, which binds them

together and lifts them to a higher sphere. Their differences, no doubt, are great : on some points they are opposed to each other like day and night. But they could not be what they are, they could not have achieved what they have achieved, unless the spirit of truth and the spirit of love had been alive in the hearts of their founders, their first missionaries and messengers.

‘Between these three powers, the religious battle of the future, the holy war of mankind will have to be fought.’

‘The same effect which Mohammedanism produced on Hinduism is now being produced in a much higher degree on the religious mind of India by the mere presence of Christianity. The silent influence began to tell many years ago, even at a time when no missionaries were allowed within the territory of the old East India Company. Its first representative was Ram Mohun Roy, the founder of Brahma-Somaj. He drew the attention of his English friends to the fact that there was a purer religion to be found in the old sacred writings of his people, the Vedas, for which he claimed a divine origin, than that which was practised by the people of his day.’

Indeed Bishop Cotton advised the use of a certain hymn of the Rig-Veda in the daily prayers of his missionary students.

But in the eyes of our missionaries the religious reforms in India have not found much favour : nor need we wonder at this. Their effect is to transplant, if possible, Christianity in its full integrity from England to India, as we might wish to transplant a full-grown tree. Thus Bishop Patterson writes :

‘I have for years thought that we seek in our missions a great deal too much to make English Christians. Evidently the heathen man is not treated fairly, if we encumber our message with unnecessary requirements. The ancient Church had its selection of fundamentals.’

And Max Müller adds :

‘If we think of the future of India and of the influence which that country has always exercised upon the East, the movement of religious reform, which is now going on, appears to my mind the most momentous in this momentous century.’

And he argues :

‘When we stand before a common enemy (as missionaries have assumed) we soon forget our small feuds. Can we not then, if we stand in spirit before a common friend (as we must recognize the Religion of the East)—can we not, before the face of God, forget our small feuds, for very shame?’

‘When we try to think of the majesty of God, what are all our formulas but the stammerings of children which only a loving Father can interpret and understand? The fundamentals of our religion are not in these poor Creeds; true Christianity lives, not in our belief, but in our love—in our love of God, and in our love of man founded on the love of God. That is the whole Law and the Prophets: that is the religion to be preached to the whole world: that is the Gospel which will conquer all other religions—even Buddhism and Mohammedanism—which will win the hearts of all men.’

cluding :

‘It must not be forgotten that the Christian faith at home is no longer what it was: that it is impossible to have one creed to preach at home and another abroad. There are many of our best men, men of the greatest power and influence in literature, science, art, politics, and law, even in the Church itself, who are no longer Christian in the old sense of the world.

‘If Christianity is to retain its hold on England and America, if it is to conquer in the Holy War of the future, it must throw off its heavy armour, the helmet of brass and the coat of mail, and face the world like David, with his staff, his stones and his sling. We want less of creeds, but more of trust; less of ceremony, but more of work; less of solemnity, but more of social honesty; less of doctrine, but more of love. There is a faith as small as a grain of mustard seed, but that grain alone can move mountains, and more than that, it can move hearts. Whatever the world may say of us, of us of little faith, let us remember that there was one who accepted the offering of the poor widow. She threw in but two mites, but that was all she had, even all her living.’

Max Müller sums up his belief in three conclusions, to which a comparative study of religions is sure to lead :

- (1) We shall learn that religions in their most ancient form, or in the minds of their authors, are gradually free from many of the blemishes that attach to them in later times.
- (2) We shall learn that there is hardly one religion which does not contain some truth, some important truth: truth sufficient to enable those who seek the Lord and feel after Him, to find Him in their hour of need.
- (3) We shall learn to appreciate better than ever, what we have in our own religion. No one who has not examined patiently and honestly the other religions of the world can know what Christianity really is, or can join with such truth and sincerity in the words of S. Paul: ‘I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.’

ASTRONOMUS INTER PROPHETAS

By the Venerable J. W. HUNKIN, M.C., O.B.E., D.D.,
Archdeacon of Coventry.

WHEN on the wireless recently some divine in an extempore prayer thanked God for the revelation which He had given through His servant Jeans, the reaction, it is said, in the minds of certain other eminent physicists was mild and somewhat derisory amusement. And while no reader can fail to perceive the religious flavour of the last pages of Sir James's brilliant and popular book, *The Mysterious Universe*, he is bound to remember what the author says in his introduction :

'The last chapter . . . merely contains the interpretations which I, a stranger in the realms of philosophical thought, feel inclined to place on the scientific facts and hypotheses discussed in the main part of the book. Many will disagree with it—it was written to this end.'

It would therefore appear worth while to inquire whether religious teachers are misinterpreting what Modern Physics really says; and indeed to try to understand more precisely what bearing the new physical discoveries have upon Theology.

The Theology of the present day may be roughly divided into two kinds: unsystematic, inexact theology, the theology (let us say) of Hyde Park; and exact, systematic theology, the theology (let us say) of Dr. Tennant. The first has been dabbling in Natural Science dangerously and often to its own disadvantage. Modern Physics has now happily supplied it with a number of much-needed correctives.

For instance, the man in the street (or rather in Hyde Park) is often in danger of feeling that in contrast with matter, mind is something unreal. But now matter has lost its solidity. It has become, as Bertrand Russell puts it, 'a mere ghost haunting the scene of its former splendours.' An atom of carbon has a diameter of one two-hundred-millionth of an inch. Magnify it till it becomes as large as Waterloo Station, and what would you see? You would see a great empty space with six tiny objects flying like wasps with incredible rapidity around a centre or nucleus.

Or again, until recently the general public suspected that the universe was inhabited, and that the universe probably contained other worlds very similar to our own. But modern astronomy definitely rejects such a probability. The emergence of an inhabited world, as we know it, is due to the convergence and cumulative effect of such a vast number of factors that it is so unlikely that such a combination occurs anywhere else in the universe. So that the old argument which created a difficulty in the minds of some, '*if one Incarnation here, then many in other worlds,*' and other similar arguments, go by the board.

Our third illustration shall be taken from a wider field, and regard to it the results of Physics agree with those of other departments of Natural Science. Evolution, as (for example) founded by Herbert Spencer, was regarded as *gradual* evolution. Variations began ever so slightly : one stage was reached after another through a vast number of almost imperceptible mutations. And so the age-long process assumed the appearance of self-development, impressive in its apparent simplicity : a slow uninterrupted moving forward of blind mechanical processes. But now Modern Science has established the fact of discontinuity. Movement in Nature is often *per saltum*, a leap-over, a leaving out of what might have been intermediate stages. New factors suddenly emerge, factors which could never have been foretold from the previous course of development. Thus the old simplicity of the mechanistic evolutionist has proved to be a specious simplicity, and his picture has lost a great part of its attractiveness. The picture drawn by the 'emergent' evolutionist is at all events much more complicated. Again, we were, most of us perhaps, in danger of supposing that Law so reigned in the material world, that everything there was really pre-determined in such a way, that our own sense of freedom must be a mere illusion. But now—I quote what Sir Arthur Eddington said on the wireless last November :

'So far as we have gone in our probing of the material universe, we cannot find a particle of evidence in favour of determinism. . . . There is no longer any need to doubt our intuition of free-will. Our minds are not merely registering a pre-determined sequence of thoughts and decisions. Our purposes, our volitions, are genuine ; and ours is the responsibility for what ensues from them. For we are scarcely likely to accept a theory which would make the human spirit more mechanistic than the physical universe.'

In short, Professor Eddington agrees with the friend of Bishop Barnes, to whom the Bishop referred in another address in October during the same series :

‘One of my Cambridge friends years ago put the matter briefly and bluntly when he said: “I may be a fool, but I’m not an automaton.”’

Such, then, are some of the correctives which Modern Physical Science has been administering to popular ‘Hyde Park’ Theology. No attempt, of course, has been made to be exhaustive : and we will now pass on to the more exact and systematic Theology of which that expounded by Dr. Tennant in his two great volumes will serve as an excellent example.

After a preliminary inquiry in Psychology and Epistemology as to what the soul is and what knowledge is, Dr. Tennant proceeds to a candid examination of the world itself, to see whether the world itself suggests the existence of God. In order that at no stage of his argument he may assume what he is setting out to prove, Dr. Tennant omits the evidence of specifically religious experience, on the ground that such experience always, to some extent at least, depends on a belief in God’s existence.

Dr. Tennant’s main argument begins with a consideration of the postulate that *Nature is a realm of universal law*. It is important to observe that this does not mean that the world is a closed system, a mechanism and no more. It is in part and with approximation mechanically describable ; but Science neither reveals nor presupposes a rigid mechanism of microscopic entities. It is just here that Modern Physics now gives additional support to Dr. Tennant’s thesis. But we must be careful not to over-state that support and not to build too much upon it. According to the most recent investigations, either the velocity or the position of the individual particle can be discovered, but not both together. Thus the future movement of that particular particle is not at any moment predicable. The order manifested in chemical and physical change is due to the fact that when a very large number of particles are taken together the average result turns out to be capable of determination. If you toss a penny you are quite unable to predict whether it will be ‘heads’ or ‘tails’ ; but if you toss it a million times you know that roughly speaking, you will get 500,000 ‘heads’ and 500,000

ls.' And, as in the ordinary processes of Physics and Chemistry, whether in the laboratory or in Nature, immense numbers of particles always take part, the result for the world at large is just as if the behaviour of each particle was pre-determinable. So that the new discovery does not in point of fact make such a difference to our view of the order of the world as we all. Indeed, strictly speaking, its value as an argument is really, at all events, as an argument *ad hominem*, to the man in Hyde Park, who (as has already been mentioned) from what he takes to be the rigidly and completely mechanistic order of the material world is inclined to infer that our own sense of inward freedom is a delusion.

But to return to Dr. Tennant. Dr. Tennant sets out a cumulative teleological argument. There is a relatively settled order in Nature, produced and maintained by the conspiracy, the concerted and reciprocal action, of innumerable causes. The world is more or less a *cosmos*, when conceivably it might have been a self-subsistent and determinate *chaos*; in which similar events never occurred, none recurred, universals had no place, relations no fixity, and things no nexus of determination. There is, in other words, an *adaptation of thought to things*. Recent astronomy provides us with striking illustrations of the way in which thought can penetrate into the world around us, reaching up to the distant star and down to the minute electron. The order of the world proves to be a highly mathematical order. In the now famous words of Sir James Jeans :

'The universe begins to look more like a great thought than a great machine.'

The very fact that the universe is so amenable to thought is in itself of great significance.

Again, Dr. Tennant draws attention to the adaptiveness both within the organic realm and of the inorganic world in relation to the organic :

'The fitness of our world to be the home of living beings depends upon certain primary conditions, astronomical, thermal, chemical, etc., and on the coincidence of qualities apparently not causally connected with one another, the number of which would doubtless surprise anyone wholly unlearned in the sciences; and these primary conditions, in their turn, involve many of secondary order' (p. 86).

This, of course, is a re-statement of the old 'Design' argument for the existence of God.

Dr. Tennant goes on to inquire what the beauty and sublimity of Nature suggest to us. They do not indeed offer us demonstrative proof, but they do seem to put before us '*persuasive considerations*.' Modern Physics has enabled us to get as it were a closer view of the structure of the universe. If we go to the Persian Exhibition and see a beautiful rug, it is of interest not merely to look at it as a beautiful whole but to examine the intricacies of its composition: to see how its pattern is worked out, and so on. Under the guidance of Sir James Jeans we have been seeing the universe as something marvellously intricate as well as superbly grand.

And finally we come to what is the last term and crown of Nature's long upward effort, *viz.* man himself: and the whole process of Nature is capable of being regarded as instrumental to the development of intelligent and moral creatures. Is the explanation simply that the universe is to be attributed to the design and creativeness of a Being Whose purpose is, or includes, the realization of moral values?

If so, at first sight the provision of so many empty worlds seems a difficulty. If man is the purpose of creation, or the main purpose, why this waste of energy? But, as Mr. G. I. Bradby reminds us in his charming little book, *Christianity and Common Sense*, the term 'waste' is not really applicable to God. 'If, in order to boil a small kettle, we were to set fire to a coal mine, instead of lighting a spirit lamp, we should be guilty of wicked waste. . . . But if, by a mere act of will, we could replace the energy so lost, in the same or in an equally available form, and if time were of no importance, to light a coal mine would be just one way of boiling a kettle, and as good as another. Thus even if man were the sole purpose of creation, the universe would simply be 'one way of effecting that purpose . . . a superbly grand way.' But there is no reason to think that man is the sole purpose of the universe. 'The spectacle of the starry heavens, even as we see it from earth, is one of extraordinary beauty, and it seems probable that, if we could see the universe as a whole from some point outside it, it would assume a form of even more extraordinary beauty. Are we not justified in assuming that it is beautiful also to the Creator?'

(But to return to man. Man is (as we have said) the crown of Nature's long upward effort; and *one* purpose of the whole process of Nature would certainly appear to be the development of intelligent and moral creatures. If so, the explanation that lies nearest to hand is that the universe is due to the design and creativeness of a Being Whose purpose includes the realization of moral values. Further back than such a creative spirit it could be neither needful nor possible to go. But further back in the world we can and must go, because the notion of a non-intelligent world that produces intelligent beings and makes itself intelligible, that can have no purpose and yet abundantly seems to bespeak one, is not the clearest and most reason-satisfying that our minds can build wherein to rest.

Here (in Chapter iv of Volume II) Dr. Tennant has arrived at the hill-top of his argument, and in the succeeding chapters of the book he describes the view which from that point of vantage presents itself. The *world-ground*, as reached by inquiry into the natures of the world and man, is a satisfactory explanation-principle solely in virtue of its possession of intelligence and purposiveness, and therefore it must needs be conceived in terms of the notion of personality. Whatever else it may or may not include, it is at least characterised by intelligence, valuation and volition. God is 'a determinate spirit who is an artist and a lover as well as a geometriser.'

It is impossible in so brief a summary to do justice to Dr. Tennant's splendidly sustained and developed reasoning. His argument advances without circularity (at all events without any vicious circularity) and demonstrates the reasonableness of belief in God. So much even Dr. C. D. Broad allows. 'Dr. Tennant's method,' he writes, 'tends to a form of theism which is intellectually and morally respectable and in practice inoffensive.' 'And,' he continues, 'if one *must* try to explain the ultimate and formulate the ineffable, Dr. Tennant's type of conclusion is perhaps the least unintelligible explanation and the least misleading formulation available to us here and now.'

Philosophical argument cannot establish ethical theism as a certainty. It can, however, show that it is a reasonable belief. Dr. Tennant has shown that it is a reasonable belief. For more than that we must turn to religious experience.

Dr. Tennant as has already been mentioned, leaves specific religious experience out of his argument for the very good reason that such experiences always assume the belief in God which Dr. Tennant himself must not take for granted until his final conclusion points to it. But suppose we have followed his reasoning and have been convinced that belief in God is reasonable, our next step, if we wish for further verification, will be to act upon the belief : to worship, to pray, to be thankful, to order our lives on the assumption that there is a Father in Heaven who cares for the world and for the children of His creation.

Many of those who have in this way put the belief to the test enter into an experience which at last, as they would testify, brings them *certitude*. And, if it does, Eddington, Quaker as well as physicist, would bid them hold it fast. In passing from scientific observation and study of the physical world into the realm of spiritual experience we are by no means passing from the real to the illusory. Now that the modern physicist has carried his work to a greater perfection than formerly, he puts it in a form which does not hide its incompleteness. What he is dragging to light as the basis of all phenomena that come within his province is a scheme of symbols connected by mathematical equations. He leads us by easy and fascinating stages, from picture after picture, till at last we pass beyond pictures to tensors and non-commutative algebra. Whether, while we know physical things indirectly, we know our own minds directly (as Professor Eddington alleges and Professor Alexander denies) we are certainly in some sort of intimate contact with our minds. Professor Eddington is not a trained metaphysician and Professor Alexander is, and Professor Alexander may very well be technically correct. But if we become conscious that our spirits are *en rapport* with a Divine Spirit, we need not distrust that consciousness. It is in accord with a belief about the universe as a whole which is as reasonable as any other : indeed if we may accept Dr. Tennant's cogent demonstration, more reasonable than any other.

Towards the close of the Conway Memorial Lecture for 1915, on *The Stoic Philosophy*, Sir Gilbert Murray quotes an expression of Dr. Edwyn Bevan's : 'A Friend behind phenomena.' That, he says, 'is the assumption which all religions

ake, and sooner or later all philosophies.' Sooner or later all philosophies : all *holding* philosophies, that is; all philosophies that hold the human mind. If in other philosophies, void of this assumption, the mind rests for a time its equilibrium is unstable : a sudden jerk sends it right away to some other position. Here alone, on the theistic assumption—let the word pass—is it able to remain at rest.

As for me . . . when I awake and behold Thy form, I shall be satisfied.

(Ps. xvii, 15.)

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NEW GENERATION*

The New Generation claims to deal with the modern problems of parents and children. Thirty-two authors contribute to this work of 700 pages, among whom are such well-known names as Prof. B. Malinowski, C. E. Moad, R. Briffault, J. B. Watson, Havelock Ellis and Rudolph Pintner. The aim of this volume,' write the editors, 'is not so much to draw conclusions as to suggest the need for them.' We find on reading through the volume that therein lies its failure to provide, what its publishers claim for—'a handbook for parents and a Magna Charta for children.'

We usually judge a civilization by the peaks of culture within it, but the authors in this case seem to take the opposite view. Sweeping generalizations are employed both to dismiss features in our present civilization as of little value and also to prove, or to attempt proof of, various theses held by the authors. For example, on page 33 the Public School system is being attacked, and it is suggested that boys either become autoerotic, homosexual, or develop in some other abnormal direction. 'There are cases like that of Young Woodley, where a boy falls in love with one of the few women he ever sees, a housemaid or a master's wife, but such cases are rare largely because of the type of women schoolmasters marry and the type of women these employ as housemaids.' It is of interest to notice, incidentally, that education is measured by the Public Schools' system, which is, after all, only one of the many prevalent forms.

Again (p. 66), Christianity is thus summarily dismissed by Dr. J. B. Watson : 'Think of millions of adults to-day who believe in the Bible and in the Biblical story of creation—in a heaven—in a life hereafter—in an Immaculate Conception—in the Divine Nature of Jesus—in the heavenly Triad, Father, Son and Holy Ghost—in miracles—that prayer can be effective.' This statement is, to him, of great importance, for it appears in italics. Yet, while we might feel sympathy with him in some of his lamentations, we hope he does not consider this very mixed grill as representative of the Christian faith of a growing multitude of modern Christians.

Part I ends with an analysis by Mr. C. E. Moad of objects held in reverence. God, Military Glory, The State, Parents, Money, Machines in turn are reviewed. He possesses the art of Tolstoy in revealing the absurdities of worship offered to some of these, and asks us—referring in particular, we gather, to sports, *e.g.* polo, cricket, shooting, etc.—to 'con-

* *The New Generation*. Ed. by V. F. Calverton and Samuel D. Schmalhausen. Introduction by Bertrand Russell. (Allen & Unwin, 1930. 20/-.)

ceive for a moment a mature human being, Socrates or Plato, Buddha or Spinoza or Goethe, amusing himself with such things' (p. 97). Such sporadic references are considered to be the expression of an immature society which reveres the above-mentioned objects. Yet it would seem that these very persons cited as revered ideals which were certainly not alien to the God of the Christian faith who, we suppose, is included in the first object of false reverence.

Part II, entitled 'The Child versus Civilization,' opens with an article by Prof. Malinowski on 'Parenthood—the Basis of Social Structure.' It informs us in a short preface that it is the result of twenty years' study and reflection on the problem. We have here undoubtedly one of the best essays in the volume. Not only do we find empirical facts, but a developed theory derived therefrom which is very satisfying after the futile and fallacious generalizations of many of the essays.

Parts III and V, entitled respectively 'The Family Romance' and 'Education and Enlightenment,' overflow with the psychology of abnormality and have a distinctly Freudian bias. We are convinced that the value of studies in morbid psychology can be carried to such a degree as to weaken almost any balanced judgment of human nature. One of the most important arguments for family life which seems to be so slightly valued by these essayists consists in the emergence of the emotion of an ideal attached to the sense of ownership of children in their years of dependence, which, biologically considered, is longer as civilization advances. We are aware that the authors of these essays will not accept these as cognizable 'facts.' In this we cannot agree, for we believe that they have every claim to consideration as fundamental data of life.

Part IV deals with the 'Potentialities of the Child,' and in it are essays of no little interest to the educationist. We found the section on the 'Creative Impulse in Children' particularly attractive. Modern educational psychologists, especially those interested in *Gestalt* Psychology, will find Miss Florence Cane's article, together with the coloured plates reproducing children's drawings, of considerable value; we would have preferred a longer and more searching analysis.

The New Generation, according to Mr. Joad, feel that they have lost reverence, are scornful of ideals and destitute of beliefs. We cannot but wonder if this view of the new generation, which is taken as a basic generalization, does not itself contain either a fundamental error or an exaggerated truth. With the exception of Part IV, and Professor Malinowski's very valuable contribution to Part II, this book, if we accept it as a correct estimate of the existing situation, would leave us profoundly pessimistic. The Scriptural prophecy would seem to have been fulfilled: 'The son despises the father, the daughter rebels against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's enemies are the members of his own household.'

The New Generation is undoubtedly a suggestive and thought-provoking work and presents in a vivid and unbalanced way many twentieth-century problems to the mind of its amused yet irritated reader.

W.G.B.

HUBERT MURRAY BURGE.*

The late Bishop of Oxford would not have desired a different memorial than that provided by Lord Charnwood. Dr. Burge's life was not of the

*Discourses and Letters of Hubert Murray Burge, D.D., K.C.V.O., Bishop of Southwark 1911—1919, Bishop of Oxford 1919—1925. Edited, with a Memoir, by Lord Charnwood. (Chatto & Windus. Price 12/6.)

and to provide matter for thrilling biography, nor did its circumstances favour the production of work of scholarly value. The papers and discourses here collected reflect Dr. Burge's many interests, and all are marked by the wisdom, balance and breadth of view which so well fitted their author for the important positions he filled. The Charge delivered in Southwark Cathedral is, perhaps, slight as compared with other well-known charges, but its sane and practical character justifies a wider audience than that to which it was delivered; and the three addresses given at Albot Settlement are singularly attractive. The more theological paper on 'The Doctrine of the Trinity,' described as a 'Memorandum put before the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine by Bishop Burge as Chairman,' and referred to on p. 57 by the Archbishop of York as well illustrating the spirit in which Dr. Burge desired that the Commission should work, was not, in fact, written by him. However, Lord Charnwood is in no way responsible for its inclusion; so far as he is concerned the error was unavoidable. The letters, all addressed to Mr. A. K. Cook, of Winchester, though not very remarkable as letters, show the writer's delight in simple outdoor holidays, in reading and in politics, and a wide and varied reading. The tribute, in the last but one of them, paid to Canon Streeter indicates two things the late Bishop really cared about: he was 'greatly impressed not only by his learning but still more by the real purity of his mind.'

Lord Charnwood's Memoir, of about sixty-four pages, is delightfully written. The work of one who entertained a very deep regard for a lovable personality, it never descends to panegyric. It sketches its subject's life as Fellow of University College, Oxford, as successively Headmaster of Repton and Winchester, and as Bishop of Southwark and afterwards of Oxford. Lord Charnwood seems to have caught and portrayed the real characteristics of the man, at least so far as one who met him but seldom can judge. It notes the occasional irritation caused to friends by the Bishop's difficulty in saying no, and that 'when people approached him with a suggestion to which in the end he would certainly be opposed, he sometimes began by receiving them with a geniality which must end in their feeling disappointed and resentful.'

Dr. Burge was a characteristic example of a fine type of English Bishop:

'In Convocation his resolution to stand for the comprehensiveness of the Church and his consequent hostility to declarations and definitions intended for the defence of the faith or the reassurance of nervous people were made known from the early years of his episcopate—conspicuously so at one crisis, when only two other bishops, Dr. Percival of Hereford and Dr. Hicks of Lincoln, were with him,'

and there is no doubt that the following passage most admirably represents the true nature of Dr. Burge's mind and policy:

'It would follow from what has already been said that in a sense he might have been called a Modernist. At least he very heartily admired some men who would so call themselves. Doubtless, too, there are many opinions specially associated with Modernism which he held. If so, however, far from striving or trying to promote such opinions, he was content if they were not proscribed or called disloyal, and otherwise said little about them. He would have regarded many points, which Modernists often think important, as very unimportant indeed in their bearing upon the truth which he held most certain and most dear. To his keen historical sense and his real insight into men the

whole idea of setting up Modernism and Traditionalism as two distinct and opposing entities must have seemed full of fallacy; and the project of drafting some new creed just now cannot have seemed to him hopeful. Nor probably did his view of English people lead him to think that the hope of drawing them more generally towards the Church depended much upon the discussion and recantation of any traditional errors.'

Those responsible for this book have done well to avoid the two far volumes which Mr. Strachey has justly ridiculed. As Lord Charnwood says, 'In such a life it may well be that "nothing happens," nothing except that innumerable little things go noiselessly right instead of disastrously wrong, and innumerable men and women, small and sometimes great, do much better than they would otherwise have done.'

J. S. BEZZANT.

SEX AND SOCIETY.

The Report of the Sexual Reform Congress, held in London in September, 1929, is a formidable volume of 670 pages.* It comprises about a hundred papers, together with translations of twenty of them which were not read in English. In addition to this, there are various letters of greeting, several of which are of considerable interest. Mr. Julian Huxley, for example, writes as follows:

'The time is rapidly coming when the traditional and theological standards, by which our approach to morality and sexual problems are for the most part still regulated, will collapse; there will follow a time of chaos unless we can put other standards in their place. These standards, it appears to me, must be essentially scientific—they must be based on the study of human biology; of man as an organism, albeit a very peculiar one. Until we get such standards, our whole approach to such fundamental questions as birth control, eugenics, marriage and divorce is bound to be a false one, out of harmony with the progressive movements in other domains of life.'

In the papers which follow, or in most of them, this scientific standpoint predominates, though the human being is regarded by the majority not merely in the light of a biological specimen, but also as a rational and social being.

It is not altogether unnatural that some of these papers should deliver onslaughts upon institutional Christianity, since speaking generally the Churches have not been too helpful in the cause of sexual reform. The Congress was inclined to be encouraged by the perhaps too optimistic declaration of Mr. C. E. M. Joad that 'so far as present indications go it seems probable that science will deliver the *coup de grâce* to organised Christianity within the next hundred and fifty years.' Mr. Joad is not hostile to religion as such, but remarks that 'the religion of the future will have no bearing upon sexual matters one way or the other.'

Dr. Geikie Cobb's paper, 'The Laws of Marriage in England,' is a valuable examination of its Canon-law basis, and of its injustices and inconsistencies in present-day practice. Dr. Cobb regards divorce by mutual consent, 'which was an integral part of the Civil Law,' as being 'the cleanest mode of divorce' and the natural right of the married persons.

* *Sexual Reform Congress, London, 1929.* Edited by Norman Haire, Ch.M., M.F. (Kegan Paul. 25/-.)

experience of the Scandinavian countries indicates that there is no necessary connection between an extension of the grounds of divorce and the morals. Nor has the ecclesiastical bigot the monopoly of moral egotism :

‘It should be insisted that the marriage reformer is contending for the exaltation of marriage, and that the ecclesiastical opposition is partly materialistic and partly professional; materialistic because it believes that marriage is a mere instrument for the propagation of children; and professional because it cares little for marriage as such, and waxes fierce in its endeavour to maintain the hold of the Church over marriage as an institution. Reformers, on the other hand, are sure that when marriage is rescued from materialistic blindness and professional jealousy and put on the solid ground of “the mutual society, help and comfort which the one ought to have of the other both in prosperity and adversity,” with the procreation of children as a subordinate cause, then the married state will be seen by all to be holy, just and good.’

Dr. Cobb’s paper, which we should like to see reprinted as a pamphlet, enforced by Dr. Bernard Hollander’s address on Insanity and Divorce, quotes the findings of the Royal Commission, as does Dr. Cobb, but apparently legislation lingers, though Lord Buckmaster’s Bill did succeed being passed by the Lords. What ‘hidden hand’ has prevented its being considered by the Commons? Are politicians afraid of the rancour of Anglican and Roman piety?

It is natural that several papers should be devoted to the subject of contraception, and of these the contribution of Dr. Ernst Gräfenburg, of Berlin, will be read with most interest, in view of Mr. Eldon Moore’s remarks at the last Modern Churchmen’s Conference.

It should be noted that the paper on Sterilization of the Unfit, by Dr. D. Eder, speaks with less than the usual confidence upon this topic.

Dr. H. Wansey Bayly, speaking on the Prevention of Venereal Disease, quotes ‘that astute patriot King Edward VII,’ who, when told that certain disease was preventable, said: ‘If preventable, why not prevented?’ But the prejudice against the dissemination of knowledge of prophylactic methods (except in the fighting services) remains strong. For, for once, are the priest and Levite the chief obstacle :

‘I do not mean to suggest for a moment that the clergy are the leading opponents of the medical prevention of venereal disease, for this is not at all the case; indeed, a very great majority of ministers of religion are on the side of education in such prevention, and on one occasion it was my privilege to give an address on the subject to a Clergy Club, when every member present supported the dissemination of such knowledge. It is the *layman*, not the parson, puritan whom we are up against, and of this faddist cult it can be truly said that the “female of the species is more deadly than the male.”’

An extremely interesting paper by Mr. Laurence Housman on Sex and Censorship is one of the most valuable contributions to this volume. It tells the old story—you can be vulgar and salacious, but you must not treat the subject of sex seriously.

‘As long as the dramatist only wants to provoke the sex-laugh, he can go a long way; and his audience can be stimulated sexually almost as much as they want to be, though not quite. But if the dramatist has *ideas* about sex, or wants to deal with uncomfortable

facts, if he wants to attack social institutions or social concealment or social prejudices in sex matters, then the Censor is liable to step in.

It would almost appear to be the case that the Censor exists rather to conceal uncomfortable facts or suppress unfamiliar ideas than to protect the public against the stimulation of its unholy desires. In the case of books, the censorship may sometimes actually defeat its own end, and Mr. Housman instances the case of a whole girls' school which got hold of a copy of *The Well of Loneliness*, and read it, merely because it had been suppressed.

The paper on the Censorship of Films, by Mr. Ivor Montague, does not consider a removal or relaxation of the censorship, as far as ordinary commercial exhibition is concerned, to be desirable :

'The film industry has no conscience, and if it could create a market for pornography, and were allowed to satisfy that market, would cheerfully do so.'

As an example of film methods, Mr. Montague observes that :

'The cheaper type of American production regularly takes certain scenes in two ways, one for England and the puritan North, the other for the South American republics.'

Mr. Montague sums up as follows :

'If changes are to be made, they should not be in the direction of relaxation; rather do I demand a strengthening. The film censorship . . . should be strengthened by legislation and given both iron responsibility and power that will enable it both to licence limited presentation in dignified and worthy circumstances and to penalise abuses that licence.'

Mr. Bernard Shaw, in an address on the Need for Expert Opinion on Sexual Reform, administered to his hearers a well-needed warning :

'Modern democracy has become associated with ideas of liberty because it has abolished certain methods of political oppression. As we all allow ourselves to be actuated far too much by mere association of ideas, we are apt to think that what makes for liberty in one thing will make for liberty in all things.

'Make no mistake about modern democracy and popular government. The more the people at large have to do with government, the more we—now I am talking to members of this Society—will have to fight for our ideas and perhaps for our lives. . .

'The mass of people have no idea of liberty . . . on the contrary they are the most ferocious opponents of it; and you will have to fight. I will not say for a super-morality, because it will appear to them to be a sub-morality, but for a class-morality and even an individual morality. Certain circles of people in different degrees of spiritual development will have to claim moralities of their own in their own circles, and will have to tolerate other circles with different moralities. This is the utmost you can hope for. Do not dream that liberality is inherent in Democracy; that is the greatest mistake you can possibly make.'

In a letter of good wishes to the Congress, Mr. Hugh Walpole writes: 'While we are flying and motoring faster and faster, our civic and social notions and rules about sex are of the eighteen-fifties'; and the remark perhaps expresses what a certain number of intelligent people are now feeling. There is a demand for a little more science, as well as for a lit-

the humanity and common sense. The general impression prevailing amongst the intelligentsia comprising this Conference would appear to be that many of our troubles proceed from (to use the forcible language of the reader) 'a vicious theologic and moralistic tradition saturated with dogmatism.' But perhaps this influence is weaker than some of them suppose. Another speaker observed, our difficulties proceed from ourselves, and we have the sort of moral standards we deserve. Perhaps it does not do to be too realistic:

'Have you not heard yet, anywhere, death-bells ringing
For love and poor Romance? Biologists
And Bolsheviks are ringing them like mad—
So loud that love, we're told, will soon be lost
With dodos, dinosaurs and pterodactyls.'

perhaps, as Mr. Aldous Huxley remarks, 'Mrs. Grundy is the only deity whose worship is made compulsory by the laws of England,' and long as she remains a sentimentalist, the psychologists and the biologists will not be able to rob sex of its glamour and make realists of us all. Yet, possibly, even a realistic attitude is preferable to the strictly ecclesiastical. Here much to choose between Sigmund Freud and Alphonse de Liguori, Prince of Moral Theologians? Which is the more sinister—the psychologist or the casuist? 'In a multitude of councillors there is wisdom,' said the Wise Man, and we shall do well to yield servile obedience to no single expert.

J. C. HARDWICK.

THE LURE OF MYSTERY.*

Mr. Brabant has written an interesting and readable study of the idea of the mysterious in religion. The conception is a good deal to the fore at present, now that rationalism is out of fashion, and it was well worth stating, and indeed would be worth treating at much greater length. The view taken here is that the twin instincts to understand and to adore must not be separated without disastrous consequences. To seek to understand apart from adoration leads to pride, and to adore without trying to understand leads to servility, and both pride and servility are fatal to a deeper understanding.

'The Catholic Church ought therefore to find room for the fullest and freest enquiry; she may well, from her experience, warn enquirers of the direction they are taking; she may well protect those of her children who are better equipped for praying than understanding, against those who are better equipped for understanding than praying. Yet religious people need, above all, the warning against sluggish acquiescence in 'mysteries' they are too timid to explore. Our temptations to omniscience are few; our temptations to idleness and slipshod thinking are many.'

Yes; if only the thinkers were more devout, and the devout were more open to thinking: yet, perhaps we do well to be cautious. Thought takes us where we want to go, and carries us whither we would not. It raises problems, and these can only be solved by raising fresh ones. There is much to be said for those who decline to think, or (what is the same thing) occupy themselves exclusively, like our busier clergy, with practical problems.

J.C.H.

* *Religion and the Mysterious*. By F. H. Brabant. (Longmans, 1930. 4/-; 2/6 paper covers.)

THE ROMAN CHALLENGE.*

Dr. Coulton is a man with a mission. His great knowledge and industry are frequently devoted to testing, and often to the unattractive work of exposing, the historical claims and methods of Roman Catholic controversialists in their ceaseless propaganda. When his writings are attacked in Roman Catholic journals which allow him no right of reply, he often tries to engage his opponents in debate or correspondence, with equal opportunities for both sides, on the understanding that the contribution be published at his own expense. It is strange that the Roman champions do not relish being thus directly confronted with the errors they would fain dispel. Mr. Chesterton's method could not be more aptly summarized than in the following words :

'He pitilessly exposes folly after folly, but seldom in the other man's own words. He must first turn it into nonsense of his own, and then he can amuse himself and his credulous readers by exposing the absurdities which he has created.'

When Mr. Chesterton made certain claims on behalf of his Church which Dr. Coulton challenged, the Anglo-Catholic Bursar of the Society of the Faith (the Rev. C. E. Douglas) kindly offered to arrange a debate between Dr. Coulton and a Roman Catholic scholar to be nominated Cardinal Bourne. The issue was one of fact, *viz.* :

'Does, or does not, the "Roman Catholic Faith" require its adherents to affirm statements which are universally repudiated by what may be called the common conscience of the civilized world?'

The offer was declined, and in this book Dr. Coulton sets out the case which would have presented. Its headings include, How Romanism Grows; Heaven, Hell and the Bible; the Blessed and the Reprobate; No Salvation outside the Church; and others.

We call special attention to one matter of great immediate importance. It appears that the Westminster Catholic Federation has conducted an examination of all history books used in the L.C.C. schools, and has sent to that authority and to the publishers concerned a long list of errors which require correction; they have been printed, together with correspondence with the publishers and a Report, in three octavo volumes. In itself this is quite justified. But it has been done in secrecy. Dr. Coulton came on to the Reports by chance; they had been printed *for private circulation only*, at his attempts to obtain a copy failed. The Federation expresses, in the private documents, anxiety to receive corrections, and admonishes publishers that financial considerations ought not to stand in the way of cancelling and reprinting incorrect pages in the school books. Dr. Coulton selected nine points which the Federation regarded as fundamental, and offered to discuss by letter any two of them, and to print the correspondence. This offer was declined, and Dr. Coulton was informed that no further notice would be taken of his communications. It is hard to resist the impression that the Federation would desire the 'corrections' to be made without competent criticisms from the other side. Whatever the rights of the Roman demand for State aid for its schools, there can be no doubt that Dr. Coulton is right when he says :

'A teaching which fears ordinary cross-examination is not a teaching which any educationalist has a right to maintain at the taxpayer's expense.'

* *Romanism and Truth.* By G. G. Coulton, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A. (The Faith Press, Ltd. Price 3/6 net.)

We congratulate Mr. Douglas on the fact that his Society should have wished Dr. Coulton's book. Rome's challenge is such that the sagely rational attitude is foolishness. If her claims are true, it is of paramount importance to submit to them: if false, it is of equal importance firmly to resist them. If such claims are false, the idea that, in their presence, reverence and mushy mildness are the pre-eminently Christian virtues is one which is not derived from a study of the Gospels. Direct resistance is honourable: the 'erring elder sister' attitude is presumptuously disastrous. Such claims deferential respect is half-surrender. Those who, like Dr. Reid and Dr. Coulton, realize the need of staunch opposition to the claims of the Roman Church are by no means blind to her glories and virtues; indeed, she is only at her best when compelled to work side by side with sustained opposition. Those who engage in the work of vigilant examination of her apologetic and her methods have a thankless task: they deserve honour they will not receive. It is theirs to be regarded as agitators and troublemakers of the peace by those whose own invertebrate attitude will actually drive the Church of England to seek, with tears, a place of penitence. But we are great builders of sepulchres.

J.S.B.

IS PUBLIC RESERVATION CATHOLIC?*

This hundred-pages pamphlet is important. It arose out of an address given by Dr. Coulton at Cambridge in September, 1928, in which he referred to the controversy about Reservation in connection with Prayer Book Revision, and dissented from the Bishop of Gloucester's words that reservation is, in every true sense of the word, a Catholic custom.' Canon Villiers, a Jesuit, wrote a letter to the *Birmingham Post* in which he said Bishop was right and Dr. Coulton wrong about the antiquity of Reservation, and said:

'It is true the present form of tabernacles dates no farther back than the sixteenth century, but from the fourth century upwards the Sacrament was reserved in dove-shaped receptacles suspended from the roof over the altar or in eucharistic towers.'

In reply, Dr. Coulton, noting that Canon Villiers gave no references for his statements, suggested that Canon Villiers had not read the actual words of the Cambridge address, which referred to Reservation in the form in which it was an issue in Prayer Book Revision. A few days later he again pointed out that he spoke of Reservation 'in the sanctuary with some admissibility which would invite Adoration.' That this was quite a different matter from the bare Reservation of the consecrated Elements (*e.g.* privately), being 'in every true sense of the word a Catholic custom,' Canon Villiers ignored, and undertook to discuss the matter, as defined by Dr. Coulton, by correspondence which should be published. He did not withdraw even when Dr. Coulton modified his contention to 'we have no trustworthy evidence' for the custom, and defined 'custom' as anything observed by only 'a fairly considerable minority.'

The ensuing correspondence here published, though not without a morous side to the reader, must have proved very trying to Dr. Coulton. He publicly contradicting Dr. Coulton in September, by January Canon Villiers had neither acknowledged his misunderstanding of Dr. Coulton's

* Reservation and Catholicity. A discussion between the Rev. A. H. Villiers, Canon of the Roman Catholic Cathedral at Birmingham, and G. G. Coulton, D.Litt., Litt.D., F.A. (B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford. Price 2/6.)

thesis nor produced any evidence to justify his own statements, except on letter on Nov. 29 which conceded that 'there is not in the early records an account of the Adoration of the Sacrament so reserved, whether in doves or towers or aumbries'; but he argued that, inasmuch as Christians believed in the Real Presence, they would 'adore Christ present in the dove or tower just as readily as when on the altar at Mass.'

This called from Dr. Coulton a long letter of forty-four printed pages which is the really valuable part of this work. He traces in outline the development of the Mass, with citations from R.C. scholars and examination of them. He sets out the early evidence for the form of Reservation in which the Sacrament was taken away after the Eucharist; and this, as Dr. Burkitt pointed out in *The Times*, was 'not of a kind which any existing party would care to address as a valid or seemingly precedent for the present day.' Turning to the narrower issue, Dr. Coulton shows, with the assistance of R.C. writers of repute, how slender, dubious and ambiguous are the alleged instances of the Elements being reserved publicly in doves and eucharistic towers.

Six months after receiving this long letter, Canon Villiers attempted reply. Contending that the fifth century Mass differed from that of the second century only in accidentals and not in essentials, he is for the most part only concerned to prove that Christ was adored in the Eucharist. The few references he makes to the actual matter in dispute are, apart from his concessions, so exiguous as to be negligible. 'The evidence,' says he, 'is not clear, but it is too strong to say there is no evidence.' This should be compared with his unqualified assertion in *The Birmingham Post* a few months earlier. It is almost unbelievable, but it is true, that eight months after the dispute began, Canon Villiers said that if Dr. Coulton had stated 'openly and plainly' that there is no evidence in the early Church that the Sacrament was reserved publicly in an aumbry, he would not have questioned him! It is a pity that Dr. Coulton has not quoted in full the relevant paragraph in his original Cambridge address, but he has made the precise point in dispute explicitly clear, more than once, before Canon Villiers engaged in the correspondence. We doubt if Dr. Coulton has ever had so easy a controversial victory.

The reader who wishes to follow the matter in strictly chronological order is advised to read the pages in the following order (rather than in the order printed by Dr. Coulton), viz. 52—59, 5—52, 60—end, 1—4. Dr. Coulton's main contribution (sections 39—52), with Canon Villiers' comments thereon (sections 152—207), should be studied carefully by all who would speak on the historical aspect of the Reservation controversy, for here is information not very easily accessible elsewhere; and there is no doubt that the vast majority of those who discuss the matter 'have some very vague ideas, or, if clear, then historically inaccurate, on this very important subject.'

J.S.B.

DEAN INGE ON MORAL PROBLEMS.

In his latest book* the Dean of St. Paul's, deeply conscious of the instability of our modern civilisation which, while rejecting old standards, has not established any others in their place, undertakes the task of examining the principles and applications of Christian Ethics in the light of modern thought and modern tendencies. In a shifting world his position

* *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*. By W. R. Inge, K.C.V.O., D.D. (P. Hodder & Stoughton. Price 15 -.)

ounded on the assurance that the fundamental principles of life and man are absolute, an assurance which he for his part bases on mystical intuition. His argument is, however, in the main valid for all those who, without not laying the same stress on mystical experience as he does, still possess the same religious faith in ultimate values.

In the norm of Christian Ethics he finds in the writings of the New Testament and more particularly in the Gospels, though he holds that it is impossible to extract from them a codified system of ethics. They express a ideal which ought to shape the whole of life, the Spirit which St. Paul experienced as the Spirit of Christ. Jesus, the historical Incarnation of the Spirit, is by no means the shadowy figure which is all that the more radical critics would leave to us. 'His character lives; the Gospels give us a genuine portrait.' Though He left neither code nor system He bequeathed to Christendom 'an outlook, a manner of thinking and acting, a standard of values, which necessarily penetrate every corner of the personality.'

The Christian believes that this Spirit is the Spirit of God. He therefore believes that 'the Universe is friendly.' The Dean powerfully urges that Christian Ethics may not be separated from this Christian faith. The metaphysical defiance of a hostile universe represented in the nineteenth century by Huxley and to-day by Bertrand Russell, he characterises as a practical gesture which can hardly be saved from toppling into absurdity. Religion and ethics may not be separated. 'Homage to the ultimate values is the worship of God.'

After a survey of the ethical principles of the New Testament, Dean Inge proceeds to a detailed discussion of two great developments of early Christianity, Asceticism and Catholic Institutionalism. To the practical utility of both he allows full value, for 'though the Church in the dark ages and the middle ages may seem to have been divided between an idealism from the world and a most unspiritual worldly ambition, it was partly by means of these opposite perversions that it held its own against barbarism, and even kept alive some pitiful fragments of the ancient culture.' On the other hand, Christian Asceticism was contaminated by taboo-creation and in many of its manifestations was akin rather to the spirit of Cynicism than to the Spirit of Christ, while 'the history of the great Church is the history of a monstrous abuse, which has made the word of God of no effect by its traditions.' The valuable elements in asceticism are emphasised on self-discipline and its witness to the supreme value of the life of the spirit.

'Nevertheless, when all is said that can or ought to be said against the strangest aberration in all human history, there are profound truths in the ascetic ideal, which modern civilisation is neglecting at its great peril. In the first place, a cheap Gospel is doomed to ineffectiveness; religion demands real sacrifices of pleasure and comfort. And it is good that there should be specialists in this as in every other pursuit. There is such a thing as a vocation to the saintly life. . . . The pursuit of holiness is surely at least as worthy an object as any vulgar success.' 'Theocratic Imperialism' is condemned on purely ethical grounds and more particularly because its weapon has always been repression and persecution. Christianity is not to be identified with ecclesiasticism.

'If it be said that in regarding nearly the whole of Church history as an aberration from the intentions of the Founder I am surrendering the citadel, I cannot agree. Two thousand years are a very short

time in the history of humanity. Circumstances favoured the growth of a political Church; other circumstances may promote its decay. But the revelation of Christ is a permanent enrichment of the human race, which is very far from having yet exhausted all that the revelation potentially contains. . . . Beyond Pheidias, said Rodin, art can never go. Beyond Jesus of Nazareth, we may add, 'the moral state of humanity can never go.'

In the second half of his book Dean Inge deals with 'Problems of Social Ethics' and 'Problems of Personal Ethics' as they present themselves in our own day. While condemning a philosophy built on the inadequate basis of scientific method, a philosophy which can only issue in Atheism or Pantheism, he welcomes the general ethical influence of the scientific spirit. Of the spirit of Industrialism he is unsparingly critical. 'The middle age had made religion a business; the nineteenth century made business religion.' The result of the worship of material progress has been a strong tendency to secularise religion and, therewith, religious ethics, and thus to identify Christian ethics with programmes of political and economic reform. The American theory of 'consumptionism' is, he holds, repugnant to the spirit of Christian Ethics.

'It seems to me that, though the New Testament has very little to say about distribution, it has a great deal to say about consumption and that the homely maxim, "Waste not, want not," may be what our society most needs to-day.'

He discusses in detail the Population Question, Humanitarianism, Feminism and War. On the ground that Christian Ethics demand a care for the well-being of future generations, he insists that the Eugenic Movement is essentially Christian. 'Sir Francis Galton used to say that eugenics ought to be a religion. It is a religion, and its name is Christianity.'

The problems of personal ethics are discussed under the heads of Sex, Divorce and Suicide. Throughout the discussion the author opposes to the prevailing secularism a religious faith in the eternal values of the spiritual world. On particular points he takes a strong individual line. He advocates, for instance, two types of marriage, one a State marriage with absolute pledge to life-long fidelity, the other a Christian marriage in which the stricter obligation is undertaken. The suicide of a dying man, whom life means only the prolongation of torture he would not absolutely condemn. Such idiosyncrasy of personal view is the result of the Dean's freedom from bondage to any code or system. He would hold that a Christian has a right to freedom of ethical judgment if he is loyal to the vision of Goodness, Truth and Beauty revealed in Christ. This is the underlying principle of his book, a principle to which quotations, especially those representative of the more provocative aspects of the argument, are apt to do but scant justice. It contains an abundance of controversial matter, but, important and valuable though such matter is, throughout the whole book it is subordinate to the serene background against which it is set. Dean Inge is no easy optimist, but the faith which is in him and which finds utterance in this book enables him to close on a note of firm confidence.

'We may see strange experiments in practical Ethics, and the authority of Christ may be more widely rejected than it is to-day. I have no fear that the candle lighted in Palestine nearly two thousand years ago will ever be put out. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."'

G. L. H. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

BARTH AND MODERNISM.

lest your readers learn from Mr. Harvey's article to distrust the theory of Karl Barth and his friends, and lest they therefore either never read that theology, or only look for faults when they do read it, may I be allowed to answer some of Mr. Harvey's questions with representative quotations of a type which he does not notice?

Mr. Harvey quotes from Dr. Rashdall, 'All modern philosophers who recognise that the knowledge of God is possible are agreed that we can attain such knowledge of Him in the light of the human mind at its best'; and he suggests that here there is an unbridgeable gulf between Barthianism and Modernism. If Modernism is interpreted to mean that intellectual genius, by the fact of the size of his mind, is nearer to God than the uneducated sinner, there would be a gulf between Modernism and Barthianism. There would also be a gulf between Modernism and Christianity. In the Gospel of Jesus the Pharisees and Scribes are said to be blessed, and the Publican who knows at least some distance from God is said for that to be justified; and in the early Church 'not many wise, not many noble' learn and proclaim the message. On their side the Barthians do not, as Mr. Harvey might suggest, depreciate the intellect:

'Do not let us think poorly of thought; do not let us share in the anti-intellectualism of these days! We cannot act without thinking! The great demand which the mercy of God imposes on us is primarily the demand for right thought.'—Barth, *Christian Life*, p. 61.

'It is unmistakable that all philosophy which understands itself leads into the neighbourhood of God, but it is also unmistakable that philosophy itself cannot take the last step to God.'—Brunner, *Erlebnis, Erkenntnis und Glaube*, p. 120.

On the other hand, they recognize, as at its heart Christianity has always recognized, that it is when men are aware of their own weakness that they turn to God and know His strength; and it is when men are aware of their sin that they turn to God and know His forgiving love. For this reason it is in the depths of human need, and not only or chiefly in the heights of the world's cultural heights, that God is known.

'The saying, God helps them who help themselves,' puts the truth upside down. The man who can help himself has no God. . . . Man can only believe in God when man has urgent need of God.'—Brunner, *Zwischen den Zeiten*, viii, 2, p. 90.

'There may be the last and most wicked scepticism perhaps, a complete imperviousness to all so-called higher things, a complete failure to be impressed with anything; yet perhaps for that very reason a spirit really broken, a feeling after God, after God Himself. . . . God will be found directly from the midst of a sinful and suffering world; not from a religious height above the world. . . . A fundamental mistrust of everything which is a height in this world, a fundamental leaning towards its depths, is an inevitable result of the stirring of man by God. . . . Christianity loves therefore the poor and the suffering and the hungry and those who are unjustly persecuted.'—Barth, *Römerbrief*, pp. 41, 108, 446.

Mr. Harvey asks in the words of Harnack, 'If sin is nothing else than lack of reverence and love, how can we remedy that lack save through the proclamation of God's holy majesty and love?' How indeed! It is precisely the complaint of the Barthians against certain types of Liberal Protestantism that, by neglecting the holy majesty of God, they turned love into a lifeless concept of a vague amiability, and so cut the nerve of the Christian proclamation.

'Only the God who nevertheless loves is the God of love. Because mysticism and rationalism have no place for this nevertheless, therefore they do not know the God of love, although they may have the name. . . . It is the biblical message of reconciliation that God has really something to overcome, that His forgiveness is something that really happens, that it is, as Luther says, something which breaks through wrath. Precisely that which the modern conception finds to be strange, primitive or at any rate non-essential in the Gospel is heart.'—Brunner, *Der Mittler*, p. 440.

'God the Lord is forgiving, generous love. The thought, the concept of God is never love; for it does not come toward me. It waits till I find it; or rather it does not even wait, it exists, as the ground of the world. The God who reveals Himself is He who Himself takes the initiative, who gives Himself for us as Love. That He speaks to the sinful man, that is His forgiveness. Forgiveness is therefore the word which most clearly separates the biblical from the philosophical knowledge of God.'—Brunner, *Gott und Mensch*, p. 20.

'The last word is the kingdom of God, creation, redemption, perfection of the world through God and in God. The last word concerning God is not Draw not nigh hither! but, God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son!'—Barth, *Word of God*, p. 20.

Mr. Harvey asks, again in the words of Harnack, 'If God and World are simply contraries, how are we to understand the close relation, the equation indeed, of love of God and love of neighbour which is the heart of the Gospel?' The Barthians would question, I think, the word equation only when man has learnt the graciousness of God towards man, and response in faith of man towards God, does the love of neighbour receive its full sanction and power. It is however a dominant theme in the Barthian writings that God then calls us, not to the comfort of our private moods, mystic exaltation, or to the private building of speculative systems, but to the service of other men.

'Grace is the axe laid at the root of the contented conscience. . . . There is no more foolish misunderstanding than either to hope, on the other hand to be afraid, that Grace may become a bed of rest for theorists and mystics. . . . There is no other real and really ethical stirring of man than that which comes through Grace.'—Barth, *Römerbrief*, p. 416.

'The man who has his life in faith knows no more the urge to realise himself. God has realised him and given him his worth in dependence of his action. . . . He can begin with that which is for others the furthest goal. He lives from God hither, not hence to God. Therefore he is free for the service of others. His life direction is not reversed. It has now the same direction as God's movement; it is movement toward the world, not away from the world. Man is not to put it simply, free for service. . . . And both are one, to listen to the command of God in the present moment, and to listen to the call of neighbour in the present moment. For only in the concrete situa-

of the meeting with neighbour does God tell you what He desires from you.'—Brunner, *Gott und Mensch*, pp. 34, 37.

'Love can be understood as a nurture and practice of a mood of love, and so be changed into the opposite of what the Bible means by love. Love! that means away from yourself. Care not for yourself, not even for your love; but care for the other who even now lies at your feet.—Otto Reinhold, *Zwischen den Zeiten*, viii, 1, p. 67.

Space forbids me to quote more, but quotations on the lines of those I have given might be multiplied from the writings of Barth and his friends; their doctrine of the transcendence of God and the Word of God will be understood unless it is understood in close harmony with such sayings.

Count Keyserling has said that Barth has been the salvation of modern Protestantism. To me it seems that the position outlined in these quotations is essentially Christian. There has in the past been a place for such a thin English Modernism. It is essential to the continued life of English Modernism that where such views occur we should not turn a blind eye to them; but rather that we should recognise and welcome wherever it occurs the teaching that man as we know him is not as God, and that the worthless God in Christ proclaims His forgiveness and love of man.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

G. F. ALLEN.

MIRACLE IN CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC.

Will you permit me to say a few words with reference to the careful review of my book, *Miracle in History and in Modern Thought*, in your latest issue?

I wish to make clear that when I hold that the underlying idea in the notion of the miraculous is essential to theism, I do *not* mean that the idea of two types of causation (which I regard as the main idea in both the traditionalist notion of miracle and the traditionalist defence of 'miracles') is essential to theism. To me the 'justifying fact' for my belief in the reality of God in the universe is in the universe itself as known and as interpreted by our rational, moral and religious experience—and not in any way that it is regarded as incapable of subsumption under law. In the last resort the issue comes back, I believe, to this—What do we mean by God, and how do we come to know Him?

I tried in the contentious Chapter V of my book not to write dogmatically.

I wished, supremely, to disentangle issues. Certain things need, however, to be frankly said and to be frankly faced. The traditionalist distinction of two types of divine causation in the universe can never by us be distinguished. If there is *miraculum* (in the absolute, ontological sense) it is God Himself to know it. I do not deny the possibility of the *miraculum*. Again, it would take God Himself to do that. But I confess myself uneasy, to say the least, about modes of reasoning which argue for theoretical possibilities.

Mr. Bezzant in his review says, declaring his own position, that modern theology must recognize that 'miracles' are 'unnecessary.' Unnecessary, what? To theism, I presume. Is it, then, that *miracles* are unnecessary, but *miracle* is necessary? And, if so, is this a 'verbal repudiation' or a real repudiation?

All the issues involved, when we leave the terrain of historical and scientific enquiry, are, I feel, vaster than our conceiving. The abiding difficulty for any theistic philosophy is to conceive, in an intelligible way, of

God in His relation to the world. To me the Divine activity suggested the whole emergent or epigenetic evolutionary process does *not* suggest Divine activity which characterizes the constant and unbroken operation of particular laws. The fact of such development leads me to posit an *end* to the mind of God: and I do not see any insuperable difficulty in believing that the Divine end can be achieved by the 'operation of particular laws'. The belief in this Divine activity is not demonstrable. It is a hypothesis which best accords with our feeble endeavours to understand the universe. I find no greater difficulty in conceiving that God can achieve His ends in the 'order' of nature than by every now and again 'interfering' to achieve something which these processes left to themselves could not achieve. There is, to use the words of Lotze, in this Divine activity an *unvarying reign of law*.

As to such problems as *evil* and human *free will*, they were outside the field. Yet it is surely a strange forgetfulness of the labours of competitive theistic thinkers to suggest out of hand that the refusal to distinguish the types of causation in the universe renders such problems more 'hopeless' than the affirmation of such duality. To me the latter hypothesis raises greater difficulties. The words of Lotze, to whom I may be permitted to refer again, are true of us all: 'No one has here found the thought which would save us from our difficulty, and I know it not.' But when our finite wisdom comes to the end of its tether, we may yet believe in a solution which we do not completely understand. And so I really *may* believe that evil may be a *mode* of good—that 'all things work together for good.'

C. J. WRIGHT

Didsbury College, Manchester.

1st February, 1931.

MR. BEZZANT'S REPLY.

1. I did not 'suggest out of hand that the refusal to distinguish the types of causation' rendered the problems of free-will and evil 'hopeless'. I said that that consequence follows upon Mr. Wright's idea that 'every event in Nature—which, of course, includes man and his doings—is *immediately* caused by God.' And as to evil being 'a *mode* of good,' I replied that the one thing certain about evil is that we must think evil of it. It may, indeed, exist to be overcome, but not to be overcome by a thing which manipulates it into something other than evil. The moral conscience rejects the plea, 'Let us do evil that good may come,' and neither moral nor religion can tolerate the idea that what is immoral with man is moral with God.

2. Mr. Wright's position is that God is *immediately* active in all natural causation, and that secondary causes only operate because God is *always* using them to accomplish 'immediate ends.' What, then, does he mean by his reference to the 'operation of particular laws' as 'the processes left to themselves'?

3. I said that miracles are *evidentially* unnecessary. There was thus no need for Mr. Wright to 'presume' anything. *Miracle*, without 'miracles' is a mere abstraction, and I have no mind either to affirm or repudiate abstractions.

4. In a review which was already of excessive length I did not argue for 'two types of causation,' but merely that the reasons by which Mr. Wright repudiated the idea were not substantial. I may now add that 'the constant and unbroken operation of particular laws' can explain nothing but constant and unbroken effects. Nor do the words 'emergent'

netic' explain anything. If Mr. Wright has reasons for thinking the operations of particular laws' account for the emergence of life, and personality, such reasoning is of the kind which argues for 'retical possibilities,' in which he professes no confidence. To the they 'emerge' because God so wills, and their emergence suggests activity distinguishable from those operations of particular laws which adequate to account for them. As they 'emerge' they are *new*, and equally barren to attempt to explain them solely in terms of their antecedents or solely in terms of discontinuity. We can only be wise about after the event, and we have no knowledge of 'laws' by which they have emerged. When 'laws' have to be continually reformulated so include new events, it is misleading to describe the process as 'sub-
 scription under law,' if this means anything more than that they have been partially intelligible to us, and that such formulation is a provisional element of our knowledge. Evolution has profoundly affected our concept of the Divine creative activity. The traditional rigid dualism of 'culture' and 'nature' is rejected; but it by no means follows that we are left up to a choice between the alternatives of a wholly naturalistic or a wholly supernaturalistic interpretation. My criticism of Mr. Wright's letter V was and is that, while he says 'But what in the interests of science has to be maintained is that the term "supernatural" is not to be taken as equivalent to the term "natural,"' he denies that these terms are characterised by any distinguishable activities, and appears to think that activity or causation can be adequately interpreted in terms of one of the elements which the older rigid dualism had wrongly separated.

PETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

J. S. BEZZANT.

MODERNIST STUDY-CIRCLES.

One of the most important objects which the Modern Churchmen's Union exists to promote is the study of religion in the light of modern knowledge, and to this end the formation of Branches and Groups for study is essential. Most Branches at present choose their own courses for study, but it has been suggested that it would be valuable if Groups could be formed each year for the study of the subject of the next Conference. This would ensure a particular course of study for one year and sufficient variety in successive years. It would also strengthen the interest of members in the Conference and probably increase their appreciation of the papers read.

The subject chosen for the Conference which will be held this year at Oxford, from September 7th to 12th, is 'MAN.' The appended list of subjects and the books for reading has been drawn up by members of the Conference Committee, and it is hoped that the members of the Union will endeavour to see whether steps can be taken for the formation of Groups for study in their own areas. In University towns, of course, and perhaps in other cases, experts can be got to read papers, but the list of books contains one large and one small work on the subject, so that members can discuss these without the assistance of any expert. It is not desired to interfere with any courses already under way.

I shall be glad to render whatever assistance I can in the formation of study groups.

T. J. WOOD.

The Church House,
 Westminster, S.W. 1.

1st February, 1931.

SUGGESTED COURSE OF STUDY FOR 1931,

On the subject of the Oxford Conference, Sept. 7th—12th, viz. :
Books.

1. MAN IN RELATION TO NATURE.

(a) His biological status.

System of Animate Nature. J. A. Thomson.

Biology. H. G. Wells and J. Huxley.

Evolution. Thomson and Geddes. (H.U.L.)

Evolution. McBride. (Benn's, 6d.)

(b) Man and external Nature.

Biology. Geddes and Thomson. (H.U.L.)

Man in the Making. R. H. Marret. (Benn's, 6d.)

Our Forerunners. M. C. Burkitt. (H.U.L.)

(c) Man and his own Nature.

Social Psychology. (Bailliere, Tindall and Cox, 20/-.)

Psychology of Morals. Hadfield. (Methuen, 6/-.)

Psychology: Study of Behaviour. McDougall. (H.U.L.)

2. MAN AND RELIGION.

(a) The root of Religion.

Introduction to the History of Religion. F. B. Jevons.
(Methuen, 10/6.)

(b) The root of Morals.

Ethics. G. E. Moore. (H.U.L.)

History of Ethics. Stephen Ward. (O.U.P.)

(c) Nature and Grace.

Ethical Studies. F. H. Bradley.

What Religion Is. Bosanquet.

Speculum Mentis (Section on Religion). R. G. Collingwood
(Oxford University Press.)

3. MAN AND CIVILIZATION.

(a) The Epic and Tragedies of Civilizations.

Origins of Civilization. Fallaize. (Benn, 6d.)

Civilization or Civilizations. Goddard and Gibbons. (C
stable's, 1926.)

(b) The crisis of Modern Civilization.

The Victorian Tragedy. Wingfield-Stratford. (Routled
10/6.)

Our Changing Civilization. J. H. Randall. (Allen & Unw
12/6.)

Whither Mankind? C. A. Beard. (Longmans, 12/6.)

(c) The rôle of Religion in Civilization.

Outspoken Essays. W. R. Inge.

4. THE FUTURE OF MAN.

(a) On Earth.

Daedalus, Science and the Future. J. B. S. Haldane.

Heredity. F. A. E. Crew. (Benn, 6d.)

Population. Carr Saunders. (Two versions: one large,
small.)

Eugenics. Carr Saunders. (H.U.L.)

(b) Immortality.

Why I believe in Immortality. O. Lodge.

Man, God and Immortality. J. G. Fraser.